

3838. Also, petition of the Federal Commodities Surplus Corporation Local, United Federal Workers of America, urging passage of the 5-day week for Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3839. Also, petition of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Local 53, U. F. W. of A. endorsing House bill 8431, the Federal Workweek Act (H. R. 8428), the Federal Workers Appeals Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3840. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Puerto Rico Post, No. 1105, American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting support of petition No. 3729, which urges that the rights of citizenship be conferred on natives of the Philippine Islands now residing in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3841. By Mr. DEMUTH: Resolution of the Pennsylvania State Planning Board, urging upon Congress the creation of a permanent national planning board and suggesting that the establishment of planning and conservation regions and agencies, as provided by the Norris, Mansfield, and similar bills, be deferred pending study by, and report of recommendation from, said proposed national planning board; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3842. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York City, opposing any interruption of the pneumatic-tube mail service in the city of New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 5, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, January 19, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8432. An act to provide for a flowage easement on certain ceded Chippewa Indian lands bordering Lake of the Woods, Warroad River, and Rainy River, Minn., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 530. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the ceremonies to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the national ratification of the Constitution of the United States in Philadelphia, Pa., June 17 to 21, 1938.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and, in order to assure the presence of one, I ask that the roll be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Burke	Gillette	Logan
Andrews	Byrd	Glass	Loungan
Ashurst	Byrnes	Guffey	Lundeen
Austin	Capper	Harrison	McAdoo
Bailey	Caraway	Hatch	McCarran
Bankhead	Chavez	Hayden	McGill
Barkley	Clark	Herring	McKellar
Berry	Connally	Hill	McNary
Bilbo	Copeland	Hitchcock	Maloney
Bone	Davis	Holt	Minton
Borah	Donahay	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Bridges	Duffy	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Brown, Mich.	Ellender	King	O'Mahoney
Brown, N. H.	Frazier	La Follette	Overton
Bulkeley	George	Lewis	Pepper
Bulow	Gibson	Lodge	Pittman

Pope	Sheppard	Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg
Reynolds	Shipstead	Thomas, Utah	Van Nuys
Russell	Smathers	Townsend	Walsh
Schwartz	Smith	Truman	
Schwellenbach	Steiger	Tydings	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of colds.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH] and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is absent, attending a meeting of the project committee of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

I ask that this announcement be entered of record for the day.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from the secretary of the Mississippi Senate embodying a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON, MISS., January 20, 1938.

HON. JOHN NANCE GARNER,

Vice President of the United States,

President of the Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following joint resolution unanimously passed both houses of the Mississippi State Legislature and was today approved by Governor Hugh L. White:

### "Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Declaring the attitude of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi on the so-called antilynch bill now pending in the Senate of these United States.

"Whereas there is now being debated in the Senate of the United States a bill generally known as the antilynching bill; and

"Whereas this bill, if enacted into law, would be an invasion of the sovereign rights of the individual States of these United States; and

"Whereas this said antilynching bill, if enacted into law, would penalize innocent parties; and

"Whereas the enactment of this bill by the Congress of the United States would be an insult to the citizenship of the entire South; and

"Whereas the relations between the races in Mississippi are more amicable at this time than at any time since the Civil War, and the passage of this said bill would greatly endanger this status; and

"Whereas this bill is a vicious attack upon the democratic form of government and upon the theory of States' rights and is contrary to the purposes of the framers of the Constitution and the founders of our Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Mississippi views with grave concern this attempt to foist this political legislation upon the Southern States, and urges the Senate of the United States to uphold the theory of States' rights upon which our Federal Government was founded, and submits that the passage of the said bill would be a violation of the Constitution of the United States and an insult to the Southern States and the citizens thereof; that Hon. PAT HARRISON and Hon. THEO. G. BILBO, Senators from Mississippi, and the Honorable WILLIAM E. BORAH be commended for their actions in opposing the passage of said bill; and that the contents of this resolution be immediately telegraphed to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate. Enrolled resolution being forwarded by mail."

MISSISSIPPI STATE SENATE,  
By RAIFORD WATSON, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate telegrams in the nature of petitions from members of the Committee Pro Spanish Democracy, and the Communist Party, Eighteenth Assembly District, New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BYRNES presented the following concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Concurrent resolution thanking Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH, of Idaho, for his valiant, able, and patriotic fight against the passage of the so-called antilynching bill now pending in the United States Senate

Whereas the so-called antilynching bill now pending in the United States Senate and the Senators from the South are making a serious and unavoidable fight against its passage because it reflects on the South and its efforts for the enforcement of all laws and its ability to handle a difficult question under the conditions; and

Whereas the bill is unfair, unreasonable, and grossly sectional because it would impose big fines on law-enforcement officers in the South when they are powerless to prevent bands of men from taking persons charged with the most heinous of all crimes—that of rape—a crime that the lowest order of beasts, save man, never commits, from their custody for immediate and speedy execution, while it leaves unmentioned and untouched thugs and gangsters who, well dressed, parade in high-powered automobiles along the streets of the greatest city in the world and shoot down unsuspecting men and women for the money and jewelry they may find on their dead bodies; and

Whereas that eloquent and forceful Senator, WILLIAM E. BORAH, from that far western State of Idaho, a lifelong Republican in politics, did on last Friday, January 7, 1938, come to the aid of the southern Democratic Senators in delivering a most remarkable address against that bill, defending the South and decrying the sectionalism of such a bill and discussing the entire question in such an able and comprehensive manner, showing that such a law would even harm the progress and advancement of the Negro race and its relations to the white race in the South, and pleading with the Senate not to meddle or interfere with the South in the handling of this most difficult question: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring),* That we, members of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina as representatives of all of our people of all races, striving at all times to advance and improve the welfare of all of our people, do most sincerely and earnestly thank Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH for his broad, patriotic stand on this matter, and respectfully and prayerfully commend the good reason, judgment, and common sense set forth in his address in the United States on Friday, January 7, 1938, and ask the other Senators to join him and those Senators who share in his views and the Senators from the South in their effort to set aside this unfair, unreasonable, and dangerous bill to make way for the more pressing legislation that awaits their attention.

*Resolved further,* That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH and to the Senators from South Carolina, ELLISON D. SMITH and JAMES F. BYRNES.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Springfield, Mass., and vicinity, praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the Federal Reserve System as at present constituted and to restore the congressional function relative to coining and issuing money and regulating the value thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Industrial Union Council of Kansas City, Mo., favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 1543) to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of 1917 relating to the compensation of certain Immigration and Naturalization Service employees, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Buhler, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 2911) to promote peace and the national defense through a more equal distribution of the burdens of war by drafting the use of money according to ability to lend to the Government, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 3220) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer the title and all other interests in the old tower clock from the Escambia County Courthouse Building, acquired by the Government by deed, to the Pensacola Historical Society of Pensacola, Escambia County, Fla., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1307) thereon.

#### PRINTING SUPPLEMENT TO COMPILATION ENTITLED "TREATIES, CONVENTIONS, INTERNATIONAL ACTS, PROTOCOLS, AND AGREEMENTS"

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably, without amendment, a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) submitted by Mr. PITTMAN on the 10th instant was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That there shall be compiled and printed as a Senate document a supplement to the compilation entitled "Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements Between the United States and Other Powers," which shall be revised up to and including December 31, 1937, and that 500 additional copies be printed and bound for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

As in executive session,

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Rufus W. Fontenot, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, to fill an existing vacancy, which was ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on January 19, 1938, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2550. An act to permit the printing of black-and-white illustrations of United States and foreign postage stamps for philatelic purposes; and

S. 2940. An act to make confidential certain information furnished to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3283) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to place certain records of Indian tribes with State historical societies, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

A bill (S. 3284) for the relief of the heirs of Theodore Wedekind; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MINTON:

A bill (S. 3285) granting a pension to Pearl Littell Blocher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 3286) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wenatchee National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. POPE:

A bill (S. 3287) to authorize the exchange of lands adjacent to national forests in Adams and Valley Counties, Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A bill (S. 3288) to supplement the act approved March 2, 1887, by aiding and promoting research in the engineering experiment stations of the colleges established and designated in the several States under the provisions of the act approved July 2, 1862, and the acts supplemental thereto; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 3289) for the relief of Sarah Lee Dorsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 3290) to impose additional duties upon the United States Public Health Service in connection with the investigation and control of the venereal diseases; to the Committee on Commerce.



By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3291) for the relief of Cecil M. Autrey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 3292) to afford an opportunity of selection and promotion to certain officers of the United States Naval Academy class of 1909; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 8432. An act to provide for a flowage easement on certain ceded Chippewa Indian lands bordering Lake of the Woods, Warroad River, and Rainy River, Minn., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 530. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the ceremonies to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the national ratification of the Constitution of the United States in Philadelphia, Pa., June 17-21, 1938.

NELLIE S. WICK

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Nellie S. Wick, widow of James R. Wick, late an official reporter of debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### PREVENTION OF AND PUNISHMENT FOR LYNCHING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1507) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching.

Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BYRNES and Mr. BAILEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate agreed to an order yesterday afternoon, just before taking a recess, which directed the Chair to recognize the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] today for the purpose of concluding his speech. Therefore, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BYRNES. I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether he approves of a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of South Carolina, thanking the Honorable WILLIAM E. BORAH, of Idaho, for his valuable, able, and patriotic fight against the passage of the so-called anti-lynching bill now pending in the United States Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the concurrent resolution, and I should not like to comment on it at present, not having read it.

Mr. BYRNES. I should like to submit the concurrent resolution to the Senator from Louisiana, thinking that he may read it during the day.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I will gladly read the resolution at the very first opportunity. Mr. President, for the past 2 or 3 days I have been outlining to the Senate, as best I could, the historical background of the mongrelization of races in Egypt and in India, all of which occurred prior to the birth of Christ. Yesterday I spent most of the day in speaking on the same question, but dealing with its aspects just a little nearer home, the island of Haiti, and within the past two or three centuries; in fact, since the discovery of America by Columbus.

I believe I have shown to the Senate, by historical facts which cannot be contradicted, that wherever and whenever

the white race becomes mongrelized it is headed for decay, and that when decay sets in, it is usually first noticeable in the religious beliefs of the people.

I proceeded to show that in the two ancient countries of India and Egypt there once existed a proud civilization, and so long as that civilization remained in the hands of the Aryans, or the white race, civilization, science, art, and agriculture progressed; but just as soon as the blood of the colored race was permitted to permeate and become mixed with the blood of the whites, a mongrelization of the races began, and the first thing apparent was a change in religion, followed by a decay of that civilization, and a return sooner or later to barbaric lunacy.

Senators, I mean to bring the problem close home to you. I mean to demonstrate to the Senate and to the American people that the same lunatic barbaric activity is within the confines of our great country; and one of the places where it thrives most at this time happens to be in Harlem, in New York, the city from which, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], one of the proponents of this measure hails. I refer to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Of course, I do not mean to cast any reflection on the able junior Senator from New York. I merely desire, I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], further to bring home to the Senate the fact that these small Negro minorities which permeate and which are located throughout this country in the North and in various cities of our Nation—

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Senator believe that the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would cooperate with any minority that is not acting in the interest of all the people?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know that the Senator would do that. I will ask the Senator to draw on his own imagination. I am merely calling attention to conditions which exist in Harlem, in New York City.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. For a question.

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator from Louisiana cooperates with the people of his State in order to come back to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I certainly do to the best of my ability.

Mr. DAVIS. He does not do anything that would be detrimental to his people.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. It so happens, Senator, that my cooperation is with the white people of my State. I do not know of anything I can do in the Senate for the white people that will not benefit the colored people. I refer to general legislation, of course, and not to any legislation that would place the Negro on the same plane as the whites. I stand for white supremacy at all times. We have in Louisiana what we call a white primary. I belong to the Democratic Party of the South, and I was elected by a handsome majority as the Democratic nominee as a result of an election that was held in the white primary. Later on, in the general election, where everyone can vote, I was also elected by a handsome majority.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield and give me one further bit of information? May I ask him a question for the purpose of eliciting it?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator indicate the difference in the total vote between the white primary and the general election?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot say as to that, Mr. President, but I know it was much less in the general election, because usually in the State of Louisiana, and I think in many other Southern States, the primary decides the question. In the general election, of course, everybody is entitled to vote, but the result is a foregone conclusion and so only a small percentage of voters turn out for it.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to go into details with reference to the mongrelization of the countries in the Western Hemisphere that lie south of us. That, of course, is a little nearer home than is Haiti; but I shall devote just a few minutes to tell of occurrences in certain countries of South America which in a measure paint a vivid picture as to why the United States of America prospered while those countries, with almost the identical climatic conditions, with the same natural resources in many instances, with towering forests, great oil fields, and big deposits of all kinds of minerals, have not prospered to the extent that the United States has prospered.

It is not my purpose at this time to go into details to show the mongrelization of Brazil, the mongrelization of Chile, the mongrelization of Argentina, of Colombia, and of other countries of South America, except to say that when those countries were discovered, not long after our own country was discovered, the settlers who occupied those territories did not follow the same method of life that was followed by settlers in this country. It is a well-known fact that the early settlers of this Nation came in large numbers and brought their wives along, or white wives were later supplied for them; whereas in the South American countries, instead of the settlers bringing in white women as their wives from across the ocean, whence they came, they found it probably more convenient to associate with the natives of the new continent; and as a result of that, from the beginning, there started a mongrelized population in those countries.

I do not mean to charge that the great country of Brazil is today composed entirely of a mongrelized people; but I do assert that the lack of progress in Brazil was in a large measure due to the fact that the white settlers who came to that country in the early days associated and cohabited and raised families with the people who were already in that country, and with slaves of the colored race who were imported there from other continents, who were of mixed breed, who were of the Mongolian race or of the Negro race; and, strange to say, in the great country of Brazil more progress is shown in the southern portion of it because of the fact that in the southern part of Brazil, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BERRY], the larger amount of the population came from Germany and Sweden. They were Nordics, and remained to themselves. They are there now, and to a certain extent there is in that section of Brazil more progress and greater development than elsewhere in the country, agriculturally and in every other way; and I may say that the same condition prevails in some parts of Chile and some parts of Argentina.

Mr. President, I should like to go into more of the details of this situation as it affects South America, because I feel confident that I could show the results of amalgamation of the races to the same extent as I think I exhibited to the Senate in the case of Egypt and in the case of India and also in the case of Haiti. But I agreed on yesterday to try to conclude my remarks today, although I may say that on this very important and very interesting subject I believe I could talk the rest of the week and part of next week. [Laughter.] But I promised to conclude today, and I shall try to do so. I shall therefore now attempt to bring to the attention of the Senate the social problem confronting us, and that I say is confronting us today as reflected in the proposed bill and similar bills that are now pending in the lower House of Congress.

I repeat, Mr. President, a statement I have made before. I like to quote this because it forms the basis, as it were, of my entire argument: "Political equality leads to social equality, and social equality will eventually spell the decay and downfall of our American civilization." I feel that I have brought the significance of this home to you, Senators.

Before I go to a discussion of the conditions in Harlem I might state to the Senate that I have on my desk a very interesting speech, consisting of 78 pages. It is an address by Hon. A. Caperton Braxton, a distinguished lawyer of the Virginia Bar; as a matter of fact, president of the Virginia Bar Association in 1903, I believe. In my opinion, it would

be very appropriate to study and read this speech, entitled "The Fifteenth Amendment—An Account of Its Enactment." It will be found from a reading of the speech that the white people of the United States never believed in giving to the colored people political equality. I ask, Why was that? I shall again have to call upon my imagination, but I am just as convinced as I am of anything I have said on the floor of the Senate since I started this speech that the American people did not want the Negro to vote because, I sincerely believe, they saw the handwriting on the wall—they saw that the moment that privilege was extended to the colored people of Indiana, to the colored people of Missouri, to the colored people of New York, they would ask for the social equality for which they are now striving, and to which the pending bill and other bills are leading.

I shall read just a few short passages from this speech, in the first pages of it, merely to support the statement I have just made. Mr. Braxton stated:

The origin of Negro suffrage, as a practical thing in the United States, was the act of January 8, 1867, establishing it in the District of Columbia. Whatever, in the light of thirty-odd years' experimentation, may now be thought of its justice, wisdom, or beneficence, the fact is that until the political exigencies of the reconstruction arose, unrestricted manhood suffrage for Negroes was neither accepted nor seriously considered by the people or leading men of any State or party. The wisdom and justice of unrestricted Negro enfranchisement is claimed by some to be axiomatic; but, nevertheless, there is not a single instance of its advocacy by even a substantial minority of the white population in any community where Negroes were sufficiently numerous to make the measure more than a naked theory.

Of the 34 States forming the Union on January 1, 1861, the constitutions of 30 of them excluded Negroes from the franchise. Even in the four States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and New York, where Negroes were nominally granted suffrage, they practically cast no vote, either because scarcely any of that race resided there or else because they were excluded by educational or property qualifications. Of men over 20 years of age in 1860, there were in New Hampshire 91,954 whites and 149 Negroes; in Vermont, 87,462 whites and 194 Negroes; in Massachusetts, 339,085 whites and 2,512 Negroes; and in New York, 1,027,305 whites and 12,989 Negroes. But as each voter in Massachusetts was required to prepay his taxes and be able to read and write, and each Negro voter in New York was subject to a property qualification of \$250, not applicable to the whites, the result was that in the entire United States in 1860 there were only about 2,500 Negro voters, not one of whom resided outside of New York or New England.

Even in New England, suffrage had never been expressly conferred upon Negroes, but grew, merely by implication and construction, out of the broad language of their old constitutions. These constitutions (like those of several other States) were adopted at times when the idea of conferring suffrage upon Negroes, as a race, had never yet entered the mind of man, and when free Negroes were so scarce that they were no more contemplated by constitutional draftsmen than were Chinese or South Sea Islanders.

Later on the equally comprehensive suffrage laws of New Jersey, North Carolina, and Tennessee, where the population of free Negroes had become no longer negligible, were promptly reworded so as to admit only white men; but, in New England, the members of that race continued so few that it was not thought worth while to amend a constitution either to exclude or to admit them. Thus the Constitutions of Maine and Rhode Island remained as much unchanged after it was found that their language excluded Negroes, as did those of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts after it transpired that their language admitted them to suffrage. In the Constitution of New York alone, of all the States up to 1868, was the Negro expressly allowed to vote; but even there he was discriminated against by a heavy property qualification, not applicable to the whites, which excluded about 90 percent of the Negro voters.

Ignoring the enforced acquiescence of the Southern States during the reconstruction period, impartial Negro suffrage, when made an issue before the people, has never obtained a majority vote in a single State of the Union, save in Iowa and Minnesota, during the fall of 1868; and, at the breaking out of the Civil War in 1861, it is believed that neither under the National nor any State Government was there a single office, civil or military, filled by a Negro in the United States.

This aversion of the American people to Negro suffrage and office holding, was almost as great as their hostility to Negro slavery. From early Colonial times a large portion, if not a majority, of the white people of this country have been opposed, at least in theory, to Negro slavery. A majority of the States always prohibited it, and the remainder were deterred from abolishing it only because of practical difficulties. But, up to the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867—

The famous Reconstruction Acts, which really opened the way for the adoption of the fifteenth amendment were ushered in. At that time the good old South held the bal-



ance of power, and the Federal Government, through its strong arm, sent soldiers into the South, took charge of our governments, and the fifteenth amendment giving the Negroes the right to vote, was adopted.

Senators, if only the fifteenth amendment, giving suffrage to the Negroes had not been adopted we would be much better off today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey for a question.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator from Louisiana approve a resolution adopted yesterday by the House of Representatives of the New Jersey Legislature urging the Senator from New Jersey to vote for the antilynching bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I received a resolution of that nature from the Legislature of Louisiana I would send it back to them with my compliments, and, believe me, I would write something they would not enjoy reading. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Who is representing New Jersey in the Senate of the United States—the legislature or the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator from New Jersey, Senator SMATHERS, is representing the State of New Jersey here, and I hope he will use his good judgment and his good, common, horse sense in voting on this issue and not be guided by a few peanut politicians in his State. I know that the good white people of his State feel about this matter as the good people of the South do. Of course, I am not accusing anybody of politics on this bill, but the question is being asked, and I want to be frank in answering it. I hope that every Senator within the hearing of my voice will study this problem, will forget politics in considering it. That is what I want the Senate to do—forget politics in connection with this question. Do not look just for today or tomorrow or next week but look to the welfare of the future generations of our American civilization. Forget yourselves. Do not be selfish. Be brave and courageous.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMATHERS. May I have my question answered?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I have not answered it to the satisfaction of the Senator from New Jersey—

Mr. SMATHERS. I asked the Senator if he approved of a resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not read it.

Mr. SMATHERS. That calls for an answer—"yes" or "no."

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not read it. I do not know what it contains. If the Senator will present it to me I shall be glad to read it, to study it, and give the Senator my frank, unbiased, and unprejudiced opinion later on in the debate. That is a bargain I will make with the Senator from New Jersey. I may state to the Senator, however, that if the resolution to which he refers endorses the pending bill I would resent and scorn it.

I continue reading:

But, up to the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, the people of no single State—

Listen to this, Senators. I repeat that by reason of the fact that the South just before the war held the balance of power the fifteenth amendment, granting the Negroes the right to vote, could not be put over, and I predict now that the fifteenth amendment is the one that is going to cause trouble, not for my generation, not for the generation of my children, or my children's children, but for future generations, and I am today giving to the people of America the same arguments, the same warnings as were given the ancient white

civilizations of Egypt and of India—"Take heed before it becomes too late."

As I said yesterday, it is my sincere desire to try to make it possible for the white people to live in this country with the Negro. What I am against is an amalgamation of the Negro race with the white race, because, just as sure as the sun shines, if we have an amalgamation of races we are going to have decay, the same as came about in ancient civilizations, and results similar to those which took place in Haiti will be experienced by us, and we shall have similar results to those now being experienced in many of the South American countries.

Senators, I feel that the South was punished enough when the Federal Government saw fit to send Negro soldiers down there, who paraded in New Orleans, to the disgust of the white people of that city, in order to keep in power a mulatto governor. I do not want that to happen in my State again, and I do not want it to happen in this country if I can help it, "and I don't mean maybe." [Laughter.]

I continue reading:

But, up to the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, the people of no single State had ever voted for impartial Negro suffrage, nor had any party (including the Abolitionists themselves)—

Those, Mr. President, who were against slavery, those who fought to free the slaves—

ever declared for it in a national platform. On the contrary, although in the decade immediately preceding 1867 no less than 27 of the 37 States then in the Union had amended their constitutions, \* \* \* yet, in no single instance was the franchise extended to Negroes, but, in every case where political equality for Negroes had been suggested, it had been voted down by decisive majorities. It must, therefore, never be supposed that the sentiment against Negro slavery was, by any means, a sentiment in favor of Negro suffrage.

Even in some of the strongest antislavery States so decided was the sentiment against Negro suffrage that no greater reproach nor more damaging charge could be brought against a public man than that he favored political equality for Negroes.

Political equality. Not social equality but political equality. Those people foresaw what would happen—and I am not stretching my imagination in saying this—as did the people of ancient Egypt and India—as Jefferson foresaw, and as Lincoln foresaw, and as Douglas foresaw. I shall read again from the Lincoln-Douglas debates, and I propose to show that both of those great statesmen would not under any conditions bow down to any such demand. Most statesmen saw the handwriting on the wall. They were not politicians, they were statesmen. Men of conviction, men who loved their country. Patriots. We read about them and we are proud of what they said and what they stood for. We may not agree with all they wrote but we admire them for their honesty and sincerity of purpose.

Senators, listen to this:

As far back as 1836 Abraham Lincoln was on record as opposed to Negro suffrage.

I call to the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] that Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, the man who set the Negro free, did not believe in slavery and neither did he believe in Negro suffrage; he sought to preserve the Union, but he did not believe in political or social equality for the Negro.

I continue reading:

And in his memorable series of debates with Stephen A. Douglas in 1858, in order that his strong antislavery views might not expose him to the charge of favoring the heresy of Negro suffrage, he repeatedly emphasized his condemnation of it. In his first "pitched battle," as he called it, with Judge Douglas at Ottawa, Ohio, he said—

Listen to this. This fell from the lips of the man who gave the Negroes their freedom, who fought to preserve the Union, and who had a heart of gold and whose sympathies were for the Negro:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two which, in my judgment, will probably forbid their ever living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and, inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which

I belong having the superior position. I have never said anything to the contrary; but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the Negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence—the right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. I hold that he is as much entitled to these as a white man."

Of course, we in the South firmly believe in that principle. As I pointed out yesterday, we believe it and we practice it in the State of Louisiana and throughout the South. Never to my knowledge has there been an effort made by the State legislature, or by any officer administering the State laws, to in any way not give to the colored man his property rights to the same extent as is provided for the white man. Further than that we give the Negroes good schools and hospitalization to the same extent that we give to the white people. I said, "to the same extent." It may be that they have smaller schoolhouses, more cheaply built, but because of economic conditions the South has not been able to build any better. It is not because the South did not want to do so, but the South, because of economic conditions, had not been able to advance in the matter of education in the early days as much as it has done later, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BERRY] knows.

As I pointed out yesterday, the State of Louisiana in 1937 spent almost as much money for the education of the Negro of the State of Louisiana as the State spent in 1908 for both whites and Negroes. That is what we are trying to do for the colored people, and we want to continue to do that, I will say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. We want to try to do what Jefferson said was impossible. As I have said here on two or three occasions, Jefferson took the position that the two races could not live in the Nation separately; that sooner or later there was bound to be an amalgamation. We are trying to make them live separately in the South, to keep them to themselves. We are fighting against amalgamation.

I continue to read:

Again, and upon a subsequent occasion, referring to the same subject in a public speech, he said:

"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and the black races."

That is Lincoln talking, the man who emancipated the Negroes.

"I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office or intermarry with the white people—"

That is Lincoln, the great emancipator of the Negro race, speaking—

"and I will say, in addition, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Notwithstanding these repeated denials, it seems that the editor of an Ohio paper, in September 1859, charged that Mr. Lincoln was really "in favor of Negro suffrage." But in a speech shortly afterward at Columbus, Ohio, Mr. Lincoln indignantly denied the charges; he quoted from his former speeches on the subject; and, in conclusion, said:

"I did not say that I was in favor of Negro suffrage; but . . . twice—once substantially and once expressly—I declared against it. . . . I presume the editor of that paper is an honest and truth-loving man, and that he will be greatly obliged to me for furnishing him thus early, an opportunity to correct the misrepresentation he has made before it has run so long that malicious people can call him a liar."

That was Abe Lincoln speaking.

These repeated declarations of Mr. Lincoln against Negro suffrage were not only made in public speeches but were published at the time in the newspapers far and wide; and, in the light of those views, of which he had never then indicated the slightest modification, he was nominated and elected President by the Republican Party the next year. It was even claimed by the Republicans at that time that advocates of Negro suffrage practically did not exist; and that the alleged favoring of it by their party was a baseless charge—a kind of bugaboo gotten up by the Democrats to scare off Republican voters. In fact, Mr. Lincoln declared in one of his speeches about that period, that he had never seen anyone who was in favor of political equality for Negroes.

Such was the sentiment of the country when the Civil War broke out in 1861; and, with the possible exception of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts, there can be no doubt

that the advocates of impartial Negro suffrage could not then have mustered a corporal's guard in a single State of the Union.

In the course, however, of the next decade, covering the period of the war and the reconstruction, events transpired and conditions arose which made Negro suffrage possible of accomplishment. The principal agencies which contributed to this result were: First, gratitude to the Negro soldiers who had served in the Federal Armies—to "save the Union," as it was said; second, apprehension lest the so-called rebel element regain control of the Federal Government; and, third, the desire to perpetuate the Republican Party in power. Thus we have, as the inspiration for Negro suffrage, gratitude, apprehension, and politics—

With the accent on politics.

Three agencies, but the greatest of the three was politics.

In connection with the statement I have just read, Mr. President, I desire to file and have incorporated in the RECORD with my remarks an article by Mark Sullivan appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1938, entitled "Negro Vote Called Real Prize at Stake in Antilynch Battle—Mark Sullivan Says Northern Democrats Must Pass Bill or Break Promise to Racial Group; South, No Party to Bargain, Mutinies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1938]

NEGRO VOTE CALLED REAL PRIZE AT STAKE IN ANTILYNCH BATTLE—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS NORTHERN DEMOCRATS MUST PASS BILL OR BREAK PROMISE TO RACIAL GROUP; SOUTH, NO PARTY TO BARGAIN, MUTINIES

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, January 19.—For 2 weeks the Senate has been occupied with the antilynching bill—to the exclusion of important legislation immediately pressing. The public must wonder why the time and emphasis on the antilynching measure.

The question is the more puzzling when the state of mind of the Senate is understood. Common judgment says that if the bill comes to a roll call, perhaps 60 out of the 96 Senators will vote for it. But common judgment says also that all but a handful of the Senator would prefer that the bill be dropped. Why, then, is the measure kept before the Senate?

For the answer I borrow the words of one who knows the answer well. It is Dr. Stanley High. Dr. High, during the Presidential campaign last year, was—I quote the announcement of Dr. High's publisher—"one of President Roosevelt's closest advisers." He was a wheel horse in the campaign. He was head of the Good Neighbor League, which was affiliated with the Democratic National Committee. Because of the altruistic implications of the phrase "Good neighbor league" and because of certain humanitarian associations of Dr. High, he and his organization were a valuable regiment in the Democratic army. After the campaign, and from his familiarity with it, Dr. High wrote a book, Roosevelt—And Then? From this book the following sentences are detached. In the condensing, punctuation and a few words have been changed or omitted, but without altering the meaning. The extract explains what has been going on in the Senate:

NEGRO RALLY HERE RECALLED

"The most remarkable gathering in the Presidential campaign of 1936 was a Negro mass meeting staged in mid-October in Madison Square Garden in New York City. The expenses of the meeting were largely met by the Democratic National Committee. . . . In 60 other cities similar mass meetings were simultaneously held. A half hour of the high spot of the Madison Square meeting was broadcast over a coast-to-coast radio network—with all southern stations carefully omitted from the hook-up. . . . A few weeks later most of the northern Negroes deserted their traditional allegiance to the Republican Party and voted Democratic. . . ."

"For the time being the Democrats believe that in a good many Northern States they have swallowed up a large proportion of hitherto Republican Negroes. The Negro leaders are at the point now where they propose to make up their own minds on political and economic questions. They are becoming aware of their electoral importance. If they seek to deliver the vote it will be because—in terms of benefits for their people—they have got a price for it. The antilynching law was supported in the Senate by New York's ROBERT F. WAGNER and in the House by JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN, Democratic Representative, whose district includes most of Harlem. It was an effort to repay—in legislative coin—the debt of the Democrats of the North to the Negro voters who deserted the Republicans in the last election. . . . The Negroes, in any close election, represent the balance of power in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois. The electoral votes of those States is 157 (out of a total of 531)."

Here, then, is the situation. The Democrats in the last campaign took from the Republicans the vote of Negroes in northern cities. The vote thus acquired was extremely valuable. Now, partly to pay their 1936 debt to the Negroes—but even more to hold the Negroes in future elections—the Democrats want to pass the antilynching measure and take other steps appealing to the Negroes.



## SOUTH TOOK NO PART IN IT

But not all the Democratic leaders. Observe in the quotation from Dr. High, that, when the Democrats broadcast the Negro meeting in Madison Square Garden on the radio, "all southern stations were carefully omitted from the hook-up." The northern Democratic leaders prudently arranged that their left hand should not know what their right hand was doing.

But that prudent strategy now brings embarrassment. The Democratic Party is in the position of a man who has given a mortgage on his farm—but finds that his wife is unwilling to sign the deed. The wife says she was not a party to the contract and does not propose to be bound by it. The southern Democratic Senators resist payment of the debt to the Negroes; they resist enactment of the antilynching measure.

It is the northern Democratic leaders who are trying to pay the debt for past gratitude—and for hope of favors to come. Not all the northern Democrats. Those who really want to enact the bill are mainly a few from the Northern States in which the Negro vote is large, and who, therefore, have a direct personal interest. Some northern Democratic leaders from States having few Negro voters support the measure only tepidly, and only as a contribution to party policy in the North as a whole. Some northern Democratic Senators see the grave constitutional objections to the measure. They see also the political liabilities which are an offset to the political advantages. They see the resentment of southern Democrats, the party cleavage. They see also that much of the public everywhere may resent the cultivation of group pressure—the passage of a measure constitutionally and otherwise dubious merely for the purpose of appealing to a very small fraction of the total electorate.

As for the Republican Senators, one of them, Mr. BORAH, has pointed out the constitutional and other objections to the measure. But most of the Republican Senators recall that in the past, when the Republican Party had the Negro vote, that party introduced and supported antilynching measures.

Mr. ELLENDER. I continue reading:

In tracing the progress of Negro suffrage in the United States, from the beginning of the Civil War up to the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, little notice will be taken of the acts of the Confederate States. That the white people of those States were always unanimous in their opposition to Negro suffrage and that their final submission to it was in invitum are facts too well known to bear contradiction, or even rehearsal. The Union States alone being free from the close of the war till the proclamation of the amendment, their acts only are worth considering as expressive of public sentiment during that period.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to keep on reading this very interesting speech, and because of its length I am not going to ask for its incorporation in the RECORD, for I do not wish to burden the RECORD; but I ask the Senators who are interested in this question to read this speech, this volume entitled "The Fifteenth Amendment—An Account of Its Enactment," by A. Capperton Braxton, and think about it. Let it sink in.

Now, Mr. President, I am just about ready to bring home to you and to other Senators, to those people in the audience, and to the American people the question of religion as it affects the Negro people and to show how easily they are persuaded into voodooism and into various other forms of religion of such character that they seem to me to come from the wilds of Africa.

I am not saying this, Senators, with the idea in view of discrediting the Negro people, but my statement is based on historical facts. The quicker the Negro people of this Nation can be made to realize that the white man is their superior and that they must work with the white man in order to further advance themselves, I say, the better off will the Negro people be.

I repeat what I said on the floor of the Senate during the course of this debate on two or three occasions, that if the Negro societies scattered throughout the Nation, if the American Federation of Labor, if the church societies throughout the country who are backing this bill, would only get down to earth, study the problem, and spend the money that is being spent for false propaganda, in an effort to really eradicate lynching through education they would get somewhere; but I say that the effort to advance the Negro socially, by this form of legislation and by other forms of legislation will get them nowhere, and they might as well realize it now.

Let us take a little excursion in Harlem in New York. I presume everybody knows a little about Harlem, where it is located, and who comes from Harlem and who goes to Harlem. I am sure that there are few people in this audience who have not heard of Father Divine, the famous "god"

from Harlem. I wish to say to the Senate that this "god" is treated as a real god by certain American citizens. Imagine that! I sent to the Library of Congress yesterday or the day before and obtained only four volumes written about this "god," but I am told that there are a few more. Can you imagine, Mr. President, civilized American people, white and black, but principally black, by the thousands, seriously believing in Father Divine as God, and in his angels Magdalen and Mary and Bouquet, as I shall show after a while to be a fact.

I propose further to show to the Senate that in some parts of America, principally in Harlem—because in Harlem, as I stated yesterday, there is the thickest Negro population in the country, somehow or other they are permitted to practice almost any kind of voodooism they desire, any kind of cult or religion. I believe that in most of the Southern States they do not dare practice such cults or voodooism, because we do not permit it there, nor do we permit them to practice other forms of barbaric fanaticism. We in the South do not fool with such things, but in Harlem it seems that they thrive on it.

Let me go back to Harlem and read a few paragraphs from a little volume entitled "The Incredible Messiah—The Deification of Father Divine," by Robert Allerton Parker. Father Divine, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], happens to be the son of a Negro slave from Georgia.

Mr. BARKLEY. He cannot help that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I appreciate he cannot help it.

I will read about two paragraphs from chapter 2 of this volume by Mr. Parker to verify to a certain extent the picture of Harlem I have been attempting to paint.

Harlem intellectuals scoffed at the god from Sayville. Cynics saw in the little messiah just another gum-beater, which is Harlemese for one who talks incessantly and accomplishes nothing. To these he was but one more addition to the vast throng of prophets, fortune tellers, voodoo men, chiromancers, magicians, psychoanalysts, soothsayers, rug cutters—

Whatever that means—

cassandras, evangelists, pseudo-Mohammedan marabouts, miracle workers—all the hawksters of hope who infest Harlem's noisome side streets and set up fly-by-night tabernacles in dilapidated and mildewed parlors, in chapels, or in deserted vegetable stalls. In Harlem there seemed to be followers for them all, because every type of black man in the world had been lured there by the world-wide publicity given to its highly exaggerated advantages: black Jews—

By the way, I did not know there were black Jews—

from Abyssinia, natives of the Cameroon, half-breeds from the Antilles, refugees from chain-gangs.

That is the kind that go to see what is doing in Harlem.

But though the intellectuals scoffed, there were thousands upon thousands in whose souls the atavistic hopes of a deliverer slept; thousands who still wanted a new leader to lead them to the promised land—

Imagine that in America—

thousands who turned their minds stubbornly away from the teaching of the white man, who reverted to faith in voodoo, magic, miracles. Beneath Harlem's surface cynicism, its disillusion, lay bottomless reservoirs of faith, credulity of gullibility, as you will.

Harlem was Babel—a Babel in distress. Though the most incessant motor traffic of the metropolis passed through its avenues, white men knew little or nothing of its elements or its spirit; ignored the daily miracle of the many who lived by their wits alone; knew nothing of the amazing variety of languages that were spoken there—a dozen different African dialects, Arabic, Spanish, Greek, Portuguese, Russian—added to its own indigenous Harlemese, an argot never acquired and rarely understood by "ofays" (Harlemese for "whites").

Few white men had ever heard of the Commandment Keepers, that sect of black Jews who worshipped in a synagogue in West One Hundred and Twenty-eighth Street, and who, during the feast of Succoth, attracted attention by rituals in their windows and on the roof tops. There was only one of the swarm of cults and mysticisms, theologies and theosophies, with their interminable colloquies concerning the nature of God and His relation to man. To Harlem, God was not a pale and bloodless concept kept alive in academic test tubes, but a living, dynamic power, just as He had been in Athens, or Rome, or Alexandria.

That, Senators, paints a little picture of what is being practiced today in America, in Harlem, by these colored

people who congregate there. Because of the fact that there is in Harlem that congregation of Negroes, who go unmolested by the police when it comes to the practice of so-called religion, voodooism, I say that they will eventually, as has happened in Egypt, India, and other countries, return to barbaric lunacy; and I do not want that kind of people to head the Government in this country, nor to sit in these seats in the Senate, if I can help it. Picture this seat formerly occupied by Clay being desecrated by Father Divine or any of his angels.

Now, let me give you a little history of this "Father Divine" before I go further.

This bit of history happened to appear in *Time*, the weekly magazine. It is not very long, but it will give you an idea of Father Divine, the god of the people of Harlem, a sect down there that really believes, according to the books from which I am going to read, that Divine—the son of a slave, I will say to Governor Murphy, of Michigan, who happens to be in the Senate Chamber at present—is God himself. That type of religious fanaticism is being practiced in America; and, as I said yesterday, I do not want Father Divine or any of these cults to go into the State of Mississippi, where the Negroes predominate, or into Louisiana, where about 40 percent of our population are Negroes, and work our colored people into a frenzy by voodooism and other means, and cause them to revert to a religion making gods out of onions and goats and everything else. I do not want that to happen. [Laughter.]

Now, let me go back and read from *Time*, a weekly magazine published in this country, which is very widely read. I read from the issue of August 31, 1936. The title of the article is "Religion." Imagine! This article in the magazine is entitled "Religion"—a new sect coming in; a sect that is being written about by one of our leading magazines, so as to bring it to the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Davis] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] and the rest of the American people. Listen to Father Divine's history—"God", not Father Divine; "God"!—

At 3 o'clock one morning last week in Manhattan, Negroes of all sizes, shapes, and shades began gathering at an uptown pier on the Hudson River. Unmolested by police, the blackamoors shouted, stomped, sang, strummed. By 6 o'clock there were 2,000 of them. Then up rolled a big, blue Rolls-Royce, out of which popped a little brown man clad in gray suit, panama hat, white shirt, and honey-colored tie, in which gleamed a \$5 gold piece. "Here comes the body," bellowed followers of Rev. Maj. J. ("Father") Divine. The little man boarded one of two excursion boats moored at the pier. "We got the body," shouted Negroes hanging over her rails. Then Father Divine boarded the other boat, whose passengers cried, "Now we got the body." At a quiet signal from Harlem's benign cult leader the two boats churned out, headed up the Hudson.

Seven hours later the excursion arrived at Kingston, N. Y., where Father Divine has lately acquired a "promised land"—some 1,000 acres of farm land, worth \$160,000.

Think of that in America! I will say to my colleague [Mr. OVERTON], a promised land, bought by Father Divine for the members of his cult; trying to imitate the Bible. That cult is now willing to pray to its god, Father Divine, who happens to be the son of a Negro slave from Georgia. After a while I predict that they will perhaps be praying to an elephant, or to a flock of goats.

Plan is to settle the promised land with divine disciples who do not mind field work. While Kingstonites gaped, the divine excursionists debarked, formed a parade in which one of Father Divine's touring cars, with a stuffed white dove on the radiator cap, was preceded by mounted Negroes in berets and riding togs, followed by female "angels" in green and white satin, wearing banners blazoned "Father Divine is God."

Think of that in America—these "angels" of Father Divine, wearing banners inscribed "Father Divine is God"; letting the world know about it, I will say to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. POPE]. Think of that in America! If that is not a return to barbaric lunacy, I am willing to quit talking right now. [Laughter.]

Pennons and banners carried by marchers showed that Father Divine has a political department, a research department—

Think of "god" having a political department and a research department. Think of it! [Laughter.]

By which "The Eyes of the Lord Runneth To and Fro Throughout the Whole Earth." Swinging music for all this was furnished by a band which included not only the usual brasses and wood winds but also violins, harmonicas, accordions, ukuleles, guitars, banjos, and a portable xylophone.

I thought they were going to leave out the banjos. The instrument is liked by the colored. [Laughter.]

Watching the Kingston parade, an American Legionnaire named Harry Whitney stiffened in patriotic anger when he beheld the announcement, "Peace, Father Divine is God," stitched on a United States flag.

I do not blame him. Think of that! "Father Divine is God," stitched on a United States flag.

He summoned police, who stopped the bearer, a white woman called Fair Angel, directed her to take the flag back to the boat. Later, on the premises of the "promised land" where Father Divine was watching a few of his followers swim in a pool whose out-houses were marked "For Sisters and Brothers," the police asked for the flag, got only the little cultist's soft reply: "I am bringing peace to everyone, even if they don't want it."

Out next day was the first full-length biography of Father Divine, god in a Rolls-Royce, by John Hoshor, 37, a white Manhattanite, one-time stockbroker, now a free-lance adman and investment counsel. Impressed by Father Divine as a self-advertiser, Biographer Hoshor claims to have spent 6 months in and out of a Divine "heaven" in Harlem, pretending to be a convert and, he says, almost becoming one.

Adman Hoshor guesses that Father Divine disburses \$1,500,000 a year on his dominion—

Heaven knows where he takes it from—some say from collections, some say from a retired millionaire, and others, from Russia—

a collection of boarding houses, coal yards, laundries, restaurants, garages operated by the busy little cultist and tenanted and staffed by fanatical blacks who have surrendered their economic as well as spiritual affairs to Father Divine. Author Hoshor estimates Divine's following at 2,000,000, although other observers set it as low as 20,000. Father Divine himself claims 30,000,000.

Although Divine disciples now like to believe that their "god" was not born but was "combusted"—

However that could come about—pray tell me. I thought combustion took place in gas engines only [laughter]—

one day in 1900, at the corner of Manhattan's Seventh Avenue and One Hundred and Thirty-fourth Street, and, although the father in 1932 told a court in Mineola, Long Island, that he had been born in Providence, R. I., 52 years before as Maj. Morgan J. Devine, it is now well known that he was born George Baker, in Savannah, Ga., 58 years ago.

That is Mr. George Baker, a Negro from Georgia, who has been able to collect millions of dollars, Heaven knows how; but I propose to show in a few minutes that he is so closely connected with communism that all of this money may be coming from Russia. As I shall show after a while, somebody is giving it to him, nobody knows definitely. It may be that some big, rich philanthropists are trying to feed a lot of poor people through Father Divine; I do not know; but that money comes from somewhere, and I am going, after a while, to read the platform of Father Divine and show how closely allied he is to communism. I am certain the money does not come from heaven. That man, the "god" of Harlem, the "god" of 30,000,000 subjects in the United States—so he claims—is being publicized, photographed, and written about all over the country, and taken seriously by many—too many!

Biographer Hoshor reveals that the father's religious life began when he was a hedge cutter 30 years ago in Baltimore after he had abandoned a wife and four children.

This is "god"—a fine fellow! A deserter of wife and children—

From a black preacher called "Father Jehovah," George Baker got the nucleus of his theology: the idea that God is in everyone. Taking the name of "The Messenger," Baker went to Brooklyn, soon became associated with another of Father Jehovah's followers who called himself "The Reverend St. Bishop, The Vine" and let each of his colleagues consider himself not only the repository of a god, but a god in fact. When the Reverend St. Bishop, The Vine was arrested, tried, and jailed for a sex offense, Baker once more changed his name, this time to Major Devine. (The improved spelling was a subsequent idea.) With a dozen followers, one of



them named Penninah who was to become known as Mother Divine, the onetime George Baker moved to Sayville, L. I., where he founded his first "heaven," a cooperative boarding house where everybody worked except Father Divine. He took care of the wages.

He took care of the wages, this book says. All were paid to him, and, as I said yesterday, I would not be surprised to find that a lot of those poor Negroes who believe that Father Divine is God turned their pockets wrong side out and gave all they had to him. That is where he might get much of his money, although, as I said a while ago, there is some reference in one of these books, although I do not know how authentic it is, to the effect that Father Divine probably gets his money from Russia, from communism.

By thrifty management and accepting all the property of those who joined him as "angels," Father Divine was able to serve big and tasty banquets in his Sayville "heaven," attract visitors from Harlem. So many Negroes were journeying thither on Sundays that white neighbors became alarmed and enraged. In 1932 Father Divine, who had come to believe that only he was God, was tried for conducting a public nuisance. He was convicted, sentenced to a year in jail and a \$500 fine. Three days later the trial judge died of a heart attack. Said Father Divine: "I hated to do it."

[Laughter.]

Imagine that! Here was a judge who found Father Divine guilty of a criminal offense and sentenced him to jail, and just because, 3 days later, the breath of life was taken from the poor judge who had sentenced him, Father Divine says, "I hated to do it." I venture to say that upon the death of that judge and the subsequent statement of Father Divine he got quite a number of converts. What does the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] think about that? [Laughter.]

-Today Father Divine has 60 heavens in the District of Columbia, 24 States, and 4 countries.

Sixty heavens; and I venture to say that all the angels of every one of those 60 heavens are backing the pending bill, and perhaps there are listening to me now some who belong to those heavens, and are here praying that this pending bill and similar bills designed to give the Negroes social equality shall be enacted, so that Father Divine can have more latitude, and can go to Louisiana and Georgia and Alabama, by the aid of the Federal Government, and there show us how to manage and handle the Negro problem. Father Divine had better spend his money, time, and efforts in attempting to get the Negroes of the South to help themselves and to help us in preventing the heinous crime of lynching as the result of rape, which all of us in the South detest as much as do the people of the North and those sponsoring this bill.

Today Father Divine has 60 heavens in the District of Columbia, 24 States, 4 countries.

Think of that—60 heavens in the District of Columbia, 24 States in the Union, and 4 countries.

The biggest collection, in Harlem, costs \$30,000 a year to operate. Besides his Rolls-Royce, he owns an airplane, manned by three dusky flying angels.

[Laughter.]

That is a very appropriate name for the airplane operators, "dusky flying angels." [Laughter.]

Though the man whom his followers believe to be God gets around to as many heavens as possible, he is to be seen most often in Harlem, sermonizing at length on such topics as The Supermental Relaxativeness of Mankind.

Divine has organized a "Righteous Government Movement."

"A Religious Government Movement," and after a while I shall read to the Senate a platform which has been inserted in the RECORD—I did not check this up, and I now ask the clerk to check it for me and send to my desk if he finds it, the platform which the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here at Washington. That is my information, though I may be wrong about it; but I will ask the clerk to check it up for me.

Divine has organized a "righteous government movement," with a political platform demanding that doctors guarantee cures. "Peace" be substituted for "hello" as a telephone salutation—

Think of that, I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BERRY]; when he goes to the telephone and asks for his wife, and she responds, instead of saying "Hello," he must say "Peace." [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS. Say what?

Mr. ELLENDER. He shall say "Peace." I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to think of that. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. In just a moment. Before one can get a doctor to come to the house to treat him, as I will show a little later, the doctor must guarantee to make one well, and let him beware if his patient dies. Again, I call the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the fact that if he happens to telephone long distance to his folks back in Georgia, instead of saying "Hello" to them, he must say "Peace." [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first for a question to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Did Father Divine prescribe that the salutation "Peace" be limited to domestic conversations only, or used generally?

Mr. ELLENDER. He apparently makes no distinction, but applies it to all, and I would advise reflection on the part of Senators who are in favor of legislation of the kind now pending, and who are willing to abide by the teachings of Father Divine, and who are willing, as Mayor LaGuardia did yesterday, as I read from one of the magazines, to bow down to "his highness"—although not because he believed that he was God, but because Father Divine could deliver votes. That may be the reason why so many people are anxious to please these little congregations in Harlem, in Chicago, in Indianapolis, and in other cities of this Nation; there may be many heavens out there, and there may be many angels in those heavens who are pleading that Father Divine will please help them to elect "So-and-So" and "So-and-So" to office so that "So-and-So" and "So-and-So" can give them social equality with the white folks.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is this the same Father Divine the Senator from Louisiana referred to yesterday as a former constituent of mine, to whom the mayor of New York pledged his support before four or five thousand people in Harlem, and said he would help him get anything he wanted?

Mr. ELLENDER. He is the same "god." [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. We may therefore assume that the mayor of New York is willing to substitute the word "peace" for "hello" in telephone conversations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt about it, and probably he would gladly agree to it so as to further strengthen himself in future elections.

I repeat what I read last:

Divine has organized a "righteous government movement," with a political platform demanding that doctors guarantee cures, "peace" be substituted for "hello" as a telephone salutation, life insurance be abolished.

I have not had the time, but I would like to have the time and opportunity to find out why it is this "god" is desirous of abolishing life insurance. I am unable to stretch my imagination to find a reason. However, I may say that I promise the Senate that before this fight is over I will look this matter up and try to enlighten Senators as to why Father Divine is preaching the abolition of life insurance.

Listen to this:

Father Divine habitually ends his letters: "This leaves me well, healthy, joyful, peaceful, lively, loving, successful, prosperous and happy in spirit, body, and mind and in every organ, muscle, sinew, vein, and bone, and even in every atom, fiber, and cell of my bodily form."

[Laughter.]

That is the way he ends all the letters he writes. After a while I shall read, I may say to the Senator from Delaware

[Mr. TOWNSEND], a letter Father Divine sent to the President of the United States, in which he incorporated the same ending, and the President of the United States was invited to come to one of these jubilations in order to "git religion." [Laughter.]

Now, I leave this little article, which appeared in Time, from which I have been reading, and shall read a little passage—I state to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], written by Faithful Mary. [Laughter.] Faithful Mary, I may state to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND], happens to be one of the angels of one of those heavens in Harlem. Father Divine's "No. 1" angel. [Laughter.] This is so ridiculous that I cannot help laughing myself, but it illustrates what America is headed for if we permit an amalgamation of the Negro race with the white race.

As far as I am concerned, I would vote today to repeal the fifteenth amendment, granting suffrage to the Negro, before it is too late. I do not want any Negro Senators to sit in the Senate, and I do not want any Negro Governors to sit in the Governor's chair of any State. That is what I mean. I do not want to be misunderstood. I say it charitably, with due respect, with the sympathy that I have and always have had for the Negro people.

The Negro people need the white people more than the white people need the Negro people. History shows that whenever a Negro people has seen the light of civilization it was a light inspired by the white people. The Negroes knew no civilization before they came to Egypt. They came uncivilized from dark Africa. When they came to India they knew no civilization. They knew nothing beside the barbarism under which they had lived in dark Africa.

The Negroes came to this country, to America, in bondage. They came here as slaves, and they did not know the light of civilization until they reached the shores of America. I say that the American people have been a blessing to the Negroes. The Negroes have prospered here, they have progressed. But the Lord pity them, and the Lord pity us, if there is an amalgamation of the Negroes with the whites.

I say again to Senators and to the American people, to those who hear me, to the colored people: Political equality leads to social equality, and social equality will eventually spell the decay and downfall of our American civilization. Not only will the white people suffer then, but I say that the Negroes themselves will suffer likewise.

In Haiti the Negroes were not able to manage their own affairs and have their own government. They lack the intelligence.

Many persons will say, What has that to do with the pending bill? The danger is not written in the pending bill, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It will not be seen in the bill in so many lines thereof. But, as I said yesterday, and as I said the day before, and the day before, as I have been saying for 5 or 6 days, if the colored man is given a foot by way of political equality, he is going to demand a yard, and if he is given a yard, he will demand a rod, and if he is given a rod, he will demand 5 miles. [Laughter.] That is what I am afraid of. And I am warning America now, before it is too late to change its course, to be on the watch and to heed the advice which is now given, and which was given by the leaders of the white race in Egypt and the leaders of the white race in India when they told the then dominant race to beware of amalgamation.

They warned them to keep the colored people out. Bringing a Negro slave into Egypt was made a capital offense. Why? Because they felt that if the Negroes were permitted to come and to amalgamate with the white race their civilization would decay. I do not want that to happen here in America, because I love America too dearly.

Let me now read a little booklet entitled "God, He's Just a Natural Man," written by Sweet Angel Faithful Mary, one of the occupants of one of these heavens in Harlem, and let us see what that "sweet angel" has to say about her "god." [Laughter.]

I do not know that any Members of the Senate have ever seen a picture of this "god," Father Divine. I show

here a picture of him speaking through the "mike." Senators, look at him, "the Divine god," a Negro man who is receiving any amount of publicity because he has posed as God. Many people in America believe that he is a god. They believe in all the "angels" that are surrounding him, who collect the money and bring home the bacon. They actually believe all that. Here in America we have a condition that is startling, and one that will gain momentum if we continue to in any way grant social equality to the colored man. Just as sure as I am speaking to the Senate, they are going to come here tomorrow and the next day and the week after, urging further privileges if this legislation is enacted. I can then hear the "angel" saying, "Boy, we sho did make a good job of that. We did pass the anti-lynching bill. The new thing we's gwine to work for now is to defeat the Jim Crow law in the South." That law, as you know, forces segregation of Negroes from whites in public conveyances.

The passage of this bill will draw the Negro closer to the social plane of the white man.

Senators, we made a valiant fight for that separation in the South, and I ask Senators in all earnestness not to disturb us but to let us handle the matter as we have in the past. Lynching has been on the decline. The Negroes are our wards. We have treated them sympathetically. We know their characteristics, and all we urge is that this problem be left to the States to handle. This problem is entirely an internal one. As I have previously said during this debate on the floor, so far as I am concerned, I shall gladly support a bill giving to the Federal Government the right and jurisdiction over such crimes of lynching as originate in one State and are accomplished in another. [A slight pause. Some one was talking to Senator ELLENDER in a low tone of voice.]

I was talking about the problem down South.

We have been doing all in our power to solve this problem. When I say "we" I mean the good people of the South. We have a few vagabonds among the white people in the South, the same as are to be found in the North. There are a few cutthroats in the North among the whites. All sorts of people are to be found in this world. But I say that the good people of the South are as much, if not more, against lynching than are the people of the North. This crime is one that is mostly intrastate. That is, the crime is one that takes place mostly within a State, and there is hardly a Southern State which does not have a law on its statute books prohibiting lynching and making it a criminal offense, and that all those who participate in or who promote the lynching are liable to punishment by hanging. We as sovereign States are willing to carry out such a law. We have been making a good job of handling this situation. Lynchings have decreased from over 300 some years back to as few as 8 last year.

There is not a crime in this country which has so declined as lynching. If Senators from the North, from the East, and from the West will let us in the South alone, I can assure them that that heinous crime is going to become a thing of the past. There is not a southern governor who is not attempting and trying by every means he knows to prevent lynching. There is not a sheriff in any of the parishes of my State or the counties of the other Southern States who is not trying to do the same thing. If let alone, we are going to succeed. If the Federal Government, however, is permitted to go down there and handle this matter, it will make as dismal a failure of it as it has done in Washington in handling crimes by Negroes. If the Federal Government is permitted to do that, the Southern States will simply step aside and say, "All right, Uncle Sam, you want to do the job? You go ahead and do it. We will let George do it." Enactment of the bill will not prevent lynchings, but on the contrary, it will increase them.

Let me go back and read about Father Divine again. I know Senators are interested in Father Divine. Of course, I do not mean to accuse anyone of belonging to his cult. However, I would not be surprised if it were found that there are some within sound of my voice today who believe that this Negro from Georgia, the son of a slave, is God, and that Faithful Mary, the author of this little green book, is an



"angel," and that Bouquet, another faithful, is an "angel." If I thought I could get results, I would ask those of my audience in the gallery who so believe to hold up their hands. But I am not going to embarrass them right now. [Laughter.]

The title of this little book is "God—He Is Just a Natural Man." The title of this particular article is "'Divine' in Politics." Remember, the article is not headed "Divine Politics," but it is headed "'Divine' in Politics." [Laughter.]

Let us see what Faithful Mary has to say about Divine in politics and what, as an angel, as a close bodyguard to him, she may have overheard him say. Being an angel, sitting on the throne with him and next to him, she ought to know all about him. [Laughter.] Now let us see what this faithful soul, this faithful angel, has to tell us about her "god":

It is Divine's aim to become a political factor. Many of his lawyers have allied themselves to him with that thought in their minds.

I wonder why "god" Divine should get the lawyers with him?

They, as well as Divine, realize the potential power at the polls of his thousands of followers.

Lawyers seem to be good politicians. [Laughter.]

In the past many candidates seeking to be elected have appeared in the "kingdom" of Divine and spoken to his followers in an attempt to win their votes. Any candidate is privileged to come and speak in the "kingdom."

This is faithful Mary speaking—

Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia, of New York City, former Mayor John O'Brien, and congressional and senatorial candidates have spoken before Divine's followers.

Faithful Mary says:

Former Mayor John O'Brien and congressional and senatorial candidates have spoken before Divine's followers.

As I said a while ago, one of the authors of this bill, Senator ROBERT WAGNER, happens to be from New York. I do not know how long he has been in the Senate, but I presume that Angel Mary would not misrepresent things, and apparently congressional and senatorial candidates have spoken before Divine's followers.

"Divine" has never pledged himself to any particular party or candidate but has always stated that he leaves it to his followers to be guided by their higher intuitions.

Imagine "god" entrusting a thing like politics to his followers. He might be giving to his followers more power than he claims for himself. Think of it!

However, there was a rumor that he supported LaGuardia.

Just a rumor.

He did not come out and support LaGuardia before election. Though after election when LaGuardia won, he claimed that it was his power which elected him to office.

Of course he wanted to get close to LaGuardia.

He is clever enough not to put himself on the spot by picking a candidate.

He was afraid he might pick the loser as some other politicians do. [Laughter.]

He has sold his followers on the idea that he will control the Presidency in the year of 1940.

Remember this is Sister Mary, one of the angels of one of Divine's heavens in Harlem.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not now. She is mighty close to "god" Divine; I suppose she rubs elbows with her "god." And here is Angel Mary warning the people of this country, telling the American people—listen:

He has sold his followers on the idea that he will control the Presidency in the year of 1940.

By the eternal, if Father Divine can control 30,000,000 people in this country, I will say to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that he might be able to control the election in 1940. Watch out!

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. If Father Divine can control the Senate in 1938, is there not some basis for his pretensions that he might control the Presidency in 1940?

Mr. ELLENDER. I leave the Senator to drawn on his own imagination. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. I said "if." I did not say he was going to do it. I said "if" he could do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator if it were permissible under the rules for the Senator to yield in order that a quorum might be called and be present, so that all Senators who are supposed to be for this bill might hear the Senator from Louisiana, would he or not be agreeable to that suggestion?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not care to yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand; but, if it were permissible, would not the Senator be willing?

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot yield except for a question, but some Senators have shown little interest in the past. I suppose Senators are attending to other official business. I would rather not yield for a quorum call.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not ask the Senator to yield. I said "if it were permissible for the Senator to yield."

Mr. ELLENDER. I would yield if it were permissible, but under the rules, if I should yield for a quorum call in order that Senators might come into the Chamber and hear what Sister Mary, one of the angels of Divine, has to say, I might not later be permitted to tell them about it. Besides I am not tired.

Let us see what else is said by this angel who knows what she is talking about, for she is very close to Divine:

He believes that he can do what Townsend and Coughlin failed to do. He has stated to me that he will then have enough money to spend a million dollars a day during the height of the campaign.

I wonder where he will get that amount of money?

He says that money will buy anything.

Mr. President, did you ever hear of such a perverted mind for a "god"? Here is a "god" who is at the head of 30,000,000 people who says that money will buy anything—a "god" speaking.

He himself will not run but will back white converts of his in the Democratic and Republican primaries. There are men in public office now willing to have the backing of "Divine"—

I presume there are—

and will be under his dictates.

Is that true? Listen to what Angel Mary says. I will repeat it.

There are men—

Listen well to this, Senators—

in public office now who are willing to have the backing of "Divine" and will be under his dictates. This—

Says Angel Mary—

This "Divine" has told me—

There is no question about its authenticity. Angel Mary was told by her "god" what I have just read, so there cannot be any doubt about it, because I presume an angel would not lie. [Laughter.]

I continue the reading:

His followers created a lot of attention when they attempted to register for voting under their kingdom names, such as—

Listen to this mockery—

Sweet Charity, Loviness, Sweet Rebecca, etc. The board of elections attempted to stop them but eventually by the court's order they were allowed to vote under these names.

Imagine that! They were allowed to vote under the "angelic" names which were conferred upon them by "god"—Sister Magdalen, Sister Bouquet, Sister Rebecca. The authorities permitted these "angels," under those names, to

come and vote for a person who was running for public office.

This was a wonderful publicity stunt for "Divine," for the eyes of the politicians were turned upon him.

In January 1936 the righteous government convention of Father Divine's peace mission was held at the St. Nicholas Palace in New York. Various political parties were invited to send their representatives. The hall was packed with thousands of followers from all parts of the country. The March of Time was there filming this spectacular demonstration.

Just imagine, Senators, this "god" drew so much attention by his practices that he was not only publicized in most of the newspapers of the country, in many of the magazines, as I have shown, in several books that were written about him, but also in the movies. And here is another book from which I am going to read after a while, entitled "God in a Rolls-Royce." Think of "god" riding in a Rolls-Royce down Fifth Avenue and through the streets of Harlem, with a stuffed dove of peace on his radiator, surrounded by his "angels," and having one, I imagine, driving his car.

Various political parties were invited to send their representatives. The hall was packed with thousands of followers from all parts of the country. The March of Time was there filming this spectacular demonstration. When the camera was focused upon the audience, Divine asked the people to pull out their white handkerchiefs and wave them while singing to the music which was being played. Each person generally had two white handkerchiefs to wave. This was psychology on the part of Divine to exaggerate his numerical strength for the benefit—

Of what? Of followers? No—  
of politicians.

That is what Sister Mary says. In other words, here was "god" with 30,000,000 subjects trying to fool the politicians. Think of it! [Laughter.]

"Divine" was in all his power that night. Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, and Communist representatives were there. All of these speakers were pouring out the philosophy of their parties and at the same time paying homage to "Divine", who sat there in his chair upon the platform, smiling at his triumphal entrance into politics.

The Communist Party has flirted with Divine, making advances to him, but to no avail, as he refuses to come out openly for communism—

This is Sister Mary speaking—  
though he has gone so far as to have his followers turn out and parade with the Communists.

But yet he is not for them, so "Angel Mary" says.  
Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question; yes, sir.  
Mr. BONE. I wonder if the Senator has seen the current issue of the Washington News, containing an article by a prominent Washington, D. C., writer, Max Stern, who quotes from southern newspapers, including two newspapers from the Senator's State—the New Orleans Tribune and the New Orleans Item—and also a quotation from the Gallup poll, showing the percentage of southern voters favoring the Federal antilynching bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not, Mr. President.  
Mr. BONE. May I give this newspaper to the Senator?  
Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to have the Senator hand it to me now; and at the conclusion of my remarks, if I am able meanwhile to look at the article and comment on it, I shall be glad to do so. If I cannot do it today, I shall be glad to look at it a little later.

Mr. BONE. I am glad to hand the newspaper to the Senator. May I make a further inquiry of him?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.  
Mr. BONE. That is my purpose.  
Mr. ELLENDER. All right.

Mr. BONE. The Senator has made a very remarkable speech, in which he has clung very closely to his text. I have enjoyed hearing the Senator's discussion of the historical background of many of the matters to which he has adverted.

I am wondering what he thinks of the fact that in the first quarter of this century the white race engaged in a war in which more human beings were butchered than in a thousand years before, these thousand years stretching back through the Dark Ages and encompassing some of the greatest wars in all human history—a war, by the way, that did not involve the so-called colored races.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I do not know what is in the Senator's mind; but, as the Senator realizes, countries as a whole are very much like human beings. They have lust. They want power. They want this and they want that. I believe the powers that engaged in the war to which the Senator refers may not have thought in the light of what the people of their respective countries desired but thought of what was desired by the leaders at the head of those countries who were lustful for power.

As I showed yesterday, I think, a good many countries have lost their power, not because of mongrelization, as I indicated in answer to two or three questions, but many countries have suffered submission because they have been taken over by brute force. In this discussion I am not trying to advert to the downfall of countries other than those which have fallen because of mongrelization. I did not go into other phases of the subject. As the Senator knows, I have limited my discussion solely to some of those countries whose civilization has decayed because of the fact that their ancient culture became mongrelized.

Mr. BONE. I was asking the Senator about the effect of the impact of war on a so-called white civilization and a white culture. Does the Senator believe that another great world war, in which we, together with the other white races of the earth, should engage, might be disastrous in its effects on the white race and on so-called white culture?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. I fear this, Mr. President. Of course, I may be wrong about it, but I do not like what is going on today in the Far East with reference to Japan and China. I fear that if China and Japan finally unite—remember, they are both of the Mongolian race—and if Japan is able to make good soldiers of the Chinese people, at a time not far distant, there may be a contest between the white and the Mongolian races, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

I do not fear, however, that the white race will fail to survive and maintain its supremacy, because of the advancement of science, inventions, warfare, and everything else. I believe that the Mongolian race and lower classes of races are in the nature of copyists when it comes to scientific inventions. They are great imitators; and, if the result of such a contest were left strictly to the genius of the white race in comparison with the genius of the Mongolian and the other lower races, I am not troubled as to what may befall the white race.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.  
Mr. REYNOLDS. In pursuance of the inquiry directed to the able Senator from Louisiana by the able Senator from Washington, is it not true that the white races have declared wars upon each other; but is it not also true that those in the Far East, the Mongolians, war against one another without ever taking the trouble to declare war?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what is happening today in China. I do not know whether or not it is customary in that part of the world.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?  
Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BONE. Is the moral effect of war any less devastating and demoralizing and degrading by reason of the fact that there is not a formal declaration of war, or does the moral degradation arise from the fact of war itself?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think it makes any difference.  
Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?  
Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does not the Senator think there really is a moral obligation on the part of those warring without declaring war to let their adversaries know they are coming



to kill them, so that those whom it is proposed to kill may have an opportunity to keep from being killed?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said, I do not think that makes much difference, because they will be killed either way it goes. [Laughter.]

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BONE. Does the Senator feel that a man who is killed in an undeclared war is any less dead than a man who is killed in a perfectly properly declared war, started according to the noble rules of this game called war?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, indeed; they are both dead. [Laughter.]

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. POPE. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the recital of the exploits of Father Divine. I am wondering if the Senator thinks those exploits are confined to any one race. Does not the Senator have in mind instances of white persons conducting the same sort of a performance, or persons of the yellow races, or of any other race or class or group of people in the world? Would they not be likely to do the same sort of thing if they could do so, and get money, and get power, and have numerous followers?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho need not go beyond the city of Washington to find that out. There are such persons here in the city of Washington—high-jackers, racketeers, men who have no moral standing. They exist all over the country. That is what I told the Senator and the Senate a while ago—that down South today, in Louisiana, in my own parish, where I live, within a stone's throw of my home, probably, there are white men who, morally speaking, are only about 6 inches high. They do not have morals. When a few persons of that kind get together and lynch a poor colored man, as often happens, the history of lynching in the South will show that it has often happened that these small gangs were led by men low in morals. I say it is an indictment of the good people of the South to come before Congress now and bring up a bill that tells us that we do not know how to handle our own internal affairs—

Mr. POPE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a further question, but after the Senator asks it I should like to make further answer to his first question.

Mr. POPE. The question in my mind is as to the point the Senator desires to make with reference to the particular individual who is carrying on this sort of a racket, and the fact that he is a Negro. A white man might do the same thing; so what is the point of emphasizing the fact that he is a Negro rather than a white man?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I said a while ago that a few white men might do that; they might have a dozen or so followers; but they, so to speak, would peter out in a few days or a few weeks, when they were caught up with; but I am told that Father Divine is still going strong, and that he is still being catered to in politics.

In further answer to the Senator's question as to whether or not any whites joined these cults, I say that they did. The little red or brown book that I have here gives examples of it. I wish I had time to read them. It is only 2:30 o'clock now. I may have time before 5 o'clock. It may be that I can cite a few instances to illustrate exactly the point about which the Senator has just asked, and that is, that of these so-called "gods"—these "voodoo men" as they are termed in our section—I am going to show you an example, a case in which one of these "angels" was a white man, and this "angel" represented to a young, 16-year-old girl from Denver that she was to be the Virgin Mary, that she was immaculate; and I will show what happened to that "gentleman."

I am going to read now from the Daily Mirror. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] not to go away. This is very interesting.

I read from the Daily Mirror, New York, Friday, July 2, 1937. Listen well! I am not going to discuss it. I am merely going to read it, and then let the Senate draw its own conclusions:

Hunt finds "peace" in jail cell.

Hunt is the man who was accused of the crime.

LOS ANGELES, July 1.—Wearing trousers and blouse of rough, blue denim for the first time in his life, John Wuest Hunt, heir to a lollipop fortune and follower of Father Divine, colored cult leader, today wielded a mop in his jail cell here while awaiting sentence as a Mann Act violator.

Hunt, who called himself "Jesus the Christ"—

I do not see how Divine could permit one of his followers to call himself "Jesus the Christ" when Divine claimed that he was "god." Anyway, this fellow Hunt, who was dubbed "Jesus the Christ"—

in the fanatical cult, said that he seduced Delight Jewett, 17, Denver schoolgirl, to "provide the world with a new redeemer."

Think of that—"to provide the world with a new redeemer," so as possibly to oust Father Divine. [Laughter.]

A Federal jury found him guilty last Wednesday of transporting the girl to his Beverley Hills home here for immoral purposes. Up for sentence tomorrow, he faces 5 years in Federal prison on McNeil Island.

Hunt was optimistic over his fate.

Think of that—optimistic, hopeful, confident.

"I have found peace and prison bars cannot change it," he said. "I wired Father Divine after the jury had been out 8 hours that I was serene and unsullied. They may imprison my body, but they cannot imprison my spirit."

This is "Jesus" speaking.

"If it is decreed that I spend 5 years in prison I will remain placid. I have found peace."

This is "Jesus Christ," a disciple of "god," finding peace in a jail cell.

"Besides, I need a rest. I need time to work on a book I am writing."

Three codefendants with Hunt, Howard B. ("John the Baptist") Smith—

Another "angel" I suppose. [Laughter.]

Mrs. Agnes ("Mary Magdalene") Gardner.

I thought she was the authoress of the book I have here, but I see it was written by "Faithful Mary." [Laughter.]

And Mrs. Betty ("Peaceful Mary") Peters, all members of the New York cult, were acquitted. They had accompanied Hunt and the girl here from Denver in Hunt's \$12,000 automobile.

Mr. President, that is the case where one of Father Divine's disciples represented himself to be Jesus, and after representing himself as Jesus, seduced this young girl, and was helped by three other "angels" from some of these "heavens" of Father Divine.

I continue reading from the book by "Faithful Mary." I was reading from the last paragraph on page 44:

The Communist Party has flirted with Divine, making advances to him, but to no avail, as he refuses to come out openly for Communism, though he has gone so far as to have his followers turn out and parade with the Communists. He has done this with the thought in mind of the publicity resulting in his participating in a Communist demonstration.

Many political leaders appearing before the followers of Father Divine have committed themselves indirectly to calling Divine "god."

Mr. President, that is how far these politicians go, and I think I pointed out yesterday from an article appearing in the Forum that Mayor LaGuardia accepted an invitation to one of these meetings, and did tell Father Divine that, so far as he (LaGuardia) was concerned, Father Divine was "god," or some words to that effect. I do not want to misquote him, but as I remember, he said something of the like.

Some, in an attempt to make an impression upon the followers with their hypocritical selves, have actually called him "god."

Of course, these are nonbelievers, but they have called him "god" because they want help from him.

At the peace conference, held at St. Nicholas Palace, in January 1936, a representative of one of the major political parties cited a point that the Communists did not believe that there is a God. In his speech he pointed out the destruction of churches in Russia, by the Communists, to bear out what he was saying. While speaking, he turned to Divine who was sitting on the platform, and said: "But we know that there is a God."

This remark won the approval of the followers, for they cried out in unity, "Yes, there is 'god.'" And the politician smiled, feeling that he had played his hand well.

If I knew "Faithful Mary," who wrote this book, I would try to find out from her who that politician was. [Laughter.]

Divine has not yet succeeded in making his organization felt in the political world. He made a public threat to keep his followers away from the polls in the last election, but if they stayed away, their votes were not missed by the sizable election returns from districts where his followers were thickly populated.

Mr. President, this gives a very vivid impression of what one of the "angels" of this "god" thinks of her god, not as a god, but as a politician. There are some very interesting sidelights in this little green book, but I hardly think I will have time this afternoon to read them to the Senate. I invite Senators, and others who are present, including all the pages, to read the book. It is very interesting. To my mind it again demonstrates the return of the Negro to the barbaric lunacy of dark Africa to which I referred awhile ago.

I now wish to quote from the other volume, which was written on this "god of gods," a book entitled "God in a Rolls-Royce." [Laughter.] Think of that, not in a chariot, but in a Rolls-Royce. The book is by John Hoshor. I will read the first chapter. I do not know how interesting the first chapter is going to be, but I thought I would pass on a few stanzas of it to the Senators.

Mr. BONE. Is this fiction?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, indeed; it is divine. [Laughter.] There is no fiction about it; it is written about a god; it is a divine writing. That is how I would class it. The title of chapter 1 is "It's Wonderful." [Laughter.] Let us see if it is wonderful—

Since early morning there has been a cold, penetrating March blizzard. Since early morning a mass of more than a thousand colored men and women, interspersed generously with whites, have crowded together on the steps of the building which houses the fifth district magistrates' court of New York City, and, like too much cane sirup on a piece of corn pone, have overflowed onto the sidewalk and into the street.

Here and there some are protecting themselves from the rain by gaudy colored umbrellas, others have covered their hats with newspapers now almost soaked through, but the majority pay no attention to the rain, although wet to the skin and chilled to the bones. Nor has the state of the weather dampened their ardor as all are singing Blessed Be Thy Holy Name, Father Divine; I Love the Sweet Body of God.

Mr. President, those are the titles of the songs the congregation were singing. The author of the hymns is not given, but I presume they sprang from the mind of the "god" himself, judging by the sacredness of the titles. I repeat, one of the songs was Blessed Be Thy Holy Name, Father Divine, and the next one was I Love the Sweet Body of God. Then they were singing also I Have a Million Blessings. That is the title of another one of their songs.

And tacked on to the chorus of each song is a long chant in which the words "He's God, he's God, he's God" are repeated countless times.

An hour later the doors of the building are thrown open. Witnesses, attorneys, and others with business in the court arrive, but are hardly able to squirm through the wet throng to the entrance. The crowd does not go inside.

Some irritated clerk telephones the police and a minute before Magistrate Anthony J. Burke drives up in a popular-priced coupe, five mounted policemen appear and, forcing the mob back on each side, open a narrow pathway from the sidewalk to the doorway. The magistrate is puzzled.

Addressing the nearest Negro as he steps from his car, he questioned, "What's going on here? What's the meaning of this performance?"

"We's all waiting for Father Divine, Brother."

[Laughter.]

That is from one of the followers of Father Divine who answers the judge who was coming there to pass sentence on

"god." When this follower was asked what all the trouble was about, he said, "We is all waiting for Father Divine, Brother." In other words, he called the magistrate "Brother."

"Who is Father Divine?"

"He is God, Brother; yas, suh, God Himself."

All morning and into the middle of the afternoon the rain continues, but the brown mass remains stationary, singing, chanting, and praising Father Divine. The mounted officers are relieved at noontime by colleagues, but Father Divine's adherents choose rather to miss a meal than to miss him.

At 3:30 in the afternoon an exultant cry arises almost simultaneously from every voice in the crowd, "God's here, God's here." A shiny, dark blue Rolls-Royce town car, with raindrops glistening on its hood and top, is creeping slowly up the street. On each side is a running escort of 20 or 30 disciples.

Sitting next to the colored chauffeur, who wears an Oxford gray chauffeur's uniform and cap, is an equally conservative uniformed footman. The car is a recent model, in strictly Park Avenue condition. In spite of the thickness of massed followers on every side, the car somehow reaches the curb, and an adherent on the sidewalk cheats the footman by opening the rear door.

If an angel with wings of gold suddenly flew out through the top of the car, a mere spectator looking on for the first time would hardly be more surprised. A middle-aged, coffee-colored, little man emerges. He is so short that from a distance of about three rows of packed disciples one is able to see only the top of his pearl gray hat. But the frenzy of the shouting, gesticulating throng is in reverse proportion to the size of the man. Moans of ecstasy arise from the throats of the followers, and take the form of such exclamations as "He's God, He's God, He's God," "Isn't he sweet?", and "It's wonderful!" Big fat mammals, broad-shouldered bucks, high yallers, bright-skinned girls, white-haired patriarchs, mulattoes, creoles, and here and there an intelligent-looking white man or woman, unconsciously try to outdo one another in their expression of enthusiasm and heartfelt praises. An adherent with a large purple umbrella walks alongside Father Divine protecting him from the rain. The latter stoically accepts the adulations of one and all, merely answering, "Peace."

Not "hello," but "peace."

Accompanied by a voluptuously heavy, brown, moon-faced woman who wears her radiance like a new gown and proudly bears her excessive weight like a general on parade, Father Divine and his angel No. 1, "Faithful Mary," leisurely climb the steps and enter the building.

A skinny black youth, not yet old enough to vote, wearing a dirty colored hat that had long since lost all shape, coat and pants which even had holes in the patches, and run-over worn-out shoes three sizes too large, shuffled up to another Negro lad of somewhat similar age who sat on a bench in Central Park not far from where Lenox Avenue starts its wide crawl through the Harlem tenements.

"You all live in New York?" the former asked.

"Yeah, on 117 Street."

"Y'all work?"

"Not for 2 years—hain't been able to git a job."

"Why?"

"Jist wond'ed. Thought maybe y'all'd lend a hungry fellow a dime so's he could eat. Ah hain't had nothin' but a bowl of soup since ah got out of jail in Petersburg, Va., 3 days ago."

"You from Virginia?"

"No; Geo'ga, Columbus, Geo'ga. Ah left there couple weeks ago to hitchhike to New Yo'k. Cops put me in jail in Petersburg when they found me sleepin' in the pa'k."

"Where'd'y sleep last night?"

"Unde' the bushes here in the pa'k."

"How'd'y like some fried chicken, candied sweet potatoes, boiled cabbage, string beans, hot muffins, apple pie—all y' can eat—and coffee with cream—all y' can drink?"

The starving lad's mouth watered as he listened to the other spread such visions before him. "Ah'd think ah was in heav'n."

"C'mon, that's where we're goin'—to heaven. Ah've been eating there for 2 years—ever since ah lost m' job."

He took the other by the arm. They left the park, and walking up Lenox Avenue turned east at One Hundred and Fifteenth Street to Father Divine's Peace Mission.

Before they reached there the Harlem youth told how Father Divine had missions all over the world, how every day he fed thousands and thousands of hungry people without charging them a cent, all the food they could eat, chicken, duck, turkey, pork chops, spareribs, everything that was good. He gave them clothes and a place to sleep, and if they wanted to work he found jobs for them.

"But," inquired the wondering southerner, "where does he git all the money? He mus' be awfu' rich."

"He's the riches' man in the whole world."

"He sure mus' be wonderful."

"Wonderful! He's God, that's what he is."

Senators, I read this little article just to show how Father Divine gets some of his adherents to his religion. I do not mean to say that Father Divine has not done some good work in the Harlem district, but the thing that bothers me is the method used by him; how he gets his money, how he is able to get followers, not only in Harlem but, as has



been shown, all over the United States. I fear that if we in the South are confronted with a man of the powers of Father Divine, and the colored folks would be given the power of the ballot the same as they have it in other parts of this country, we might have sitting here in the Senate a few gentlemen we would not like to associate with socially very much. I should not want that to happen.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BONE. Does the Senator find any parallel in the situation described in the book he has been reading and the experience of one great modern nation which represents a considerable segment of the white race, to which is attributed by the press of the country an official move to get rid of the Christian Trinity or the so-called Christian theology, and substitute Woden and Thor and mythology for the Christian religion?

Mr. ELLENDER. In reply to the Senator from Washington, I will say I do believe there is such a move going on in a few countries. I do not know the details.

Mr. BONE. I mentioned no country.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know the details at present, but it is my recollection that a movement was started in Mexico not long ago to oust Catholicism, and that such a movement was started in other countries. I have not familiarized myself with the conditions leading to those changes. I am not familiar with the facts except casually.

It was my purpose to devote my time and my efforts solely to a discussion of countries where decay of civilization, progress, art, and literature set in by reason of the amalgamation of the predominant white race in those particular countries with the colored people who were brought there and enslaved. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] will agree with me, if he has either heard or read parts of my speeches with reference to Egypt and India, that there were civilizations in each of those countries which were of a very high order. The people were progressive and well advanced in all the arts and sciences and had considerable knowledge of surgery. As I have pointed out, the scientists of today are employing methods which were used back in the early Egyptian days. That shows how far advanced that ancient civilization was.

India had an advanced civilization. That country had advanced a considerable distance in its knowledge of surgery. The moment the rigid rules of the old caste system in India were relaxed, however, and the intermarriage of the white people with dark races was permitted, degradation set in, so that today India, a country which at one time was proud of its heritage because of its advances in agriculture, in science, and in every other line, has lost all of its former glory. Today science of medicine in India is nil. I am sure the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is familiar with some recent Indian history which shows that those people believed in and practiced voodooism the same as Father Divine is attempting to practice and will succeed in putting over here in America if he is permitted to go on unmolested.

As I pointed out, when discussing Indian and Egyptian history, I showed that their early religion contained some of the dogmas and doctrines that are now taught and that are now believed in by civilized peoples of today, but when there was a mongrelization of the white races, that first occupied those progressive countries, with the colored races, what happened? A decline will be noted in their religion and a return to the barbaric religious beliefs of Africa, in which the people prayed to elephants, goats, chickens, doves of peace, and things of that kind.

I am trying to show what could happen in this country. Father Divine says he has 30,000,000 Americans who believe in him. He, Father Divine, the son of a Negro slave, born in Georgia, says, "I am God." What will his followers choose to worship after he dies? They might easily go back to the barbaric lunacy of Africa.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I doubt if any Member of the Senate would assert that he was an expert in matters theological, and I also assume that most of us gather what information we are able to obtain of what is happening around and going on in the world from newspapers and magazines. That is where I get my information. But has the Senator observed newspaper articles and magazine articles with reference to what has happened in Germany in an official way with respect to the substitution of a very great degree of reverence for Woden and Thor and the mythologies for the old Christian dogmas? I do not know what is happening in Germany. I merely state what I have read in magazine articles and newspaper articles.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will state to the Senator from Washington that I have not familiarized myself with modern religious trends in Germany. I have read casually on the subject, but have never made a study of it. While on the subject I wish to say something about a country close to Germany. I wish to say something about France. France today, to my way of thinking, is heading toward a degradation of her civilization, just as in the case of Egypt and of India, unless she curbs the mixing of the whites and the Negroes.

As we all know, France has a colony in Africa not very far from her own shores, and there is no inhibition against bringing into France inhabitants of that colony. As is well known, many of the soldiers who were sent from this country to fight in France were colored men belonging to colored regiments, and it is a historical fact—I have seen it stated in print on many occasions—that our Negro soldiers left quite a good many descendants in France. I have seen that statement in writing many times. I do not know how many were left, but I am told the number amounts to thousands. On the streets of Paris, the streets of Lyons, Marseille, and other cities in France it is not at all unusual to see quite a number of colored children who were born during the World War and who were the offspring of some of our American colored soldiers. If that were the only mongrelization affecting France, I should say that it might not hurt, because there is not a sufficient number of such mongrels to injure the race. In the case of a race which is only slightly mongrelized, not mongrelized too far; in other words, let us say that the country has 50,000 mongrels out of an entire population of 50,000,000—ethnologists maintain that if no other mongrelization sets in, if no other impure blood comes in, in the course of a few generations, notwithstanding the fusion of the mongrel into the community and the mixture of that mongrel blood with that of the dominant whites, that mongrel blood will soon work itself out.

Besides suffering because some American Negro soldiers who went to fight in France left some of their descendants there, France has not taken steps to prevent the immigration of Negro population from across the Mediterranean Sea, from northern Africa, and it is thought that if France does not put a stop to that influx of Negroes, does not prevent its Negro colonists from coming across the Mediterranean into France and mixing with the French people, France, sooner or later, is headed for a mongrelization of its pure white race; and, in that event, I predict that the civilization of France, its fine arts, its medicine, its science, its culture, is going down to decay to the same extent as did the arts, the culture, the literature and the science of Egypt and India and little Haiti, and that the fate of France will be the same.

Now, Mr. President, let me go back to "god"—this "god" who rides in a Rolls-Royce. By the way, before I forget it, let me say that, in answer to a question by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], I spoke of the degradation of religion in India. I am sure that most of those who hear me have read about Mahatma Ghandi, the great Indian reformer. The reason I mention him now is that he is mentioned very prominently in this book. The author of the book seeks to make some kind of comparison between Father Divine and Mahatma Ghandi, and to show that in some respect they seem to agree on certain religious principles.

Unlike Ghandi, who declared he was "literally sick of adoration of the unthinking multitude," the plaudits of his listeners are

meat and drink to Father Divine. After interminable, repetitious verbosity saturated with polysyllabic words, into which, like an empty bottle, his hearers could pour any meaning they wished, yet with each sound mortised together by a crescendo of intensity, the colored lord climaxes his ambiguity by paraphrasing Mae West's "How'm I doin'?" with "Now, isn't that wonderful?" and his proselytes, sozzled with enthusiasm, cry out in one concordant voice, "Wonderful, God; truly wonderful."

He quotes nobody. His own word is sufficient authority. Once in a great while he will refer casually to the "first four books of the New Testament," or for purposes of illustration repeat a passage from the Scriptures; but, unlike the average preacher, who uses a Biblical text for the foundation of his sermon, Father Divine uses quotations from the Scripture as a very minor adjunct.

In other words, if a person were to read this book, he would be bound to conclude from the fact that Father Divine calls himself "god" and that he has created "angels" to sit around him, that he has forsaken the Christian religion which is now dominant in our country.

I venture to say that if Father Divine were permitted to go on unrestrained, the chances are that this civilized country of ours might revert to the barbaric lunacy which is practiced in darkest Africa. It may take some time for this to come about, but all that Father Divine needs in order to come through all right is a little time, a little encouragement, and a little money, and a little more power so that he can deliver to some of the politicians scattered throughout the country, who are willing to sacrifice our American civilization in order to attain selfish, petty offices for themselves.

In speaking he makes full use of his arms, feet, body, and of facial expressions. With his arms reaching, but not stretched, towards his audience, the elbows slightly bent and his hands turned inward, as though he is ready to pull his heart from his body, he tells them: "When I say make your mental and your spiritual contact—

This is Father Divine speaking; this is one of his doctrines; listen to it—

"When I say make your mental and your spiritual contact, it means to contact me by harmonizing with my views and dialing in on the same, by doing exactly what I would have you do." Also, "How can you make your contact if you are living in races, creeds, and colors?"

When he speaks one appreciates the truth of the second verse of one of their more popular songs, "Father Divine has you and me in the palm of his hand."

That is the title of one of the popular songs. I will repeat the title.

"Father Divine has you and me in the palm of his hand." (In the other verses he has, respectively, the world, the politicians, and the President in the palm of his hand.)

Think of that!—

In between their hallelujahs, he impresses on them, "This truth has been birthed out."

In other words born in me. He continues, "It is not confined to a person or persons, but is with the sonship degree of God, which am I. It's wonderful. It's brought into experience and manifested by one even so is the fatherhood degree, which am I. It can be universalized. I spoke last night through the telephone, but I don't have to speak through the telephone. I am everywhere. It is a blessing that one is ignorant enough to be radical enough to visualize some that has been materialized. The same can be expressed by someone else." And plagiarizing the question Jesus Christ asked the apostles, he loudly inquired:

"What do you call me?"

They answered, "God," and almost swoon in their own enthusiasm.

That is how this cult is hypnotized by this son of an ex-Negro slave, and I am just wondering what is going to happen when poor Father Divine dies, and where he is going.

This book is very, very interesting. I could read all of it to you, but it would take quite a while, perhaps a little longer than I or you should like to stay here tonight; so I shall select a few passages from it, just a few little scattered paragraphs here and there. I am going to tell the Senate the title of this book again, so that Senators will have the opportunity of getting the book from the Library and reading it, I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], and digesting it, so that they may see for themselves to what extent this "god" has been able to obtain followers and to collect millions of dollars, apparently, in order to carry on, as I have been demonstrating to the Senate.

Here is what one of the disciples, Brother Lamb, said:

Brother Lamb also stated that the "accident of our complexions was in no way related to the purity of our souls," and that we were all equal members of the family of God. The divine disciples live this truth and "when they enter a restaurant and some are refused service they all decline to eat there and leave."

Here is an innovation that Father Divine is practicing. In other words, if Angel Mary or Angel Bouquet happens to go into some restaurant on Fifth Avenue, and is refused admittance and permission to eat there, the rest of the cult soon know it, and they keep away from that restaurant. I wonder if the proprietor is angry about it! [Laughter.]

A drive has already been started in Baltimore, according to Brother Lamb, to wipe out racial discrimination there.

Brother Lamb, one of the disciples, one who lives in heaven, is working in Baltimore, trying to wipe out racial discrimination there. I desire to state that before I get through today it is my purpose to read to the Senate the platform that this "god" is preaching throughout the Nation.

The local leader is a disciple "of our complexion," and is being assisted by Father's spirit and the other children.

To the question why he selected that particular spiritual name, Brother Lamb replied, "That describes my ideal of life."

In other words, "What is your name?" "Brother Lamb." "Why were you called 'Brother Lamb'?" "Because that describes my ideal of life."

Asked about politics, Brother Lamb told on one hand of the attempt of the politicians to get Father's support and votes, and on the other hand of Father's continual harassment by the minor officials of the health, fire, and building departments in New York City.

"They impose on us," he stated, "rules and regulations that they overlook in every other building in Harlem."

"Why doesn't Father Divine use his political influence on them?" he was asked.

"Father wouldn't do that; he works only through the spirit," was the answer. Continuing, Brother Lamb spoke of a woman judge who the day before had come to Father to ask his cooperation in establishing an institution for prostitutes. He added, "Father doesn't believe in that either, but perhaps some basis of cooperation can be found."

"Why are there so few missions in the South?" the questioner desired to know.

"Father has missions in all the important large cities of the South. Many more down there would like to join with Father, but they are afraid of the civil authorities."

That is down South. They are not so much afraid of the civil authorities down there as they are of the law itself which prevents the practice of such religious cults as operate in Harlem. We do not permit it down there.

"Many more down there would like to join with Father, but they are afraid of the civil authorities." Brother Lamb agreed that Father's work was facing very great difficulties below the Mason and Dixon's line.

You may bet your last dollar he told the truth that time!

The next paragraph is devoted to a person to whom I paid my respects awhile ago, by the name of John Wuest Hunt, who seduced a young girl from Denver. It is not my purpose to read the life history of that follower of Father Divine.

Now let me come to Lily Dove. Lily Dove happened to be another "angel" of Father Divine, one of those glorified "angels" selected to associate in "heaven" with Father Divine. [Laughter.]

Lily Dove, a coal black, baby-faced girl about 25, who works in the front office of the Spoken Word, pointed to a facsimile of a postcard recently carried in that publication. The original postcard had been mailed from China to "God, Harlem, New York, U. S. A.," and delivered to Father Divine.

That was the only address on that postcard—just "God, Harlem, New York"—and of course Angel Lily Dove was very much gratified to find out that a postcard sent from China, thousands of miles away, merely addressed "God, Harlem, New York," had reached the "Father," the "god." She was so proud of it that they made facsimiles of this postcard, and are showing it throughout the country. I am again stretching my imagination—so that new adherents of this cult may be made. I can just imagine these poor people saying, "Why, God is known everywhere. He's known



out in China. We've got a postcard from China. The only address on that postcard was 'God, Harlem, N. Y.,' and she just come away to Harlem! Therefore, we're sure that God is known away out in China!"

The girl disciple stated:

"The Government don't recognize Father's 'Peace', and they make us pay double postage; but that shows they know who he is all right; they know he's God."

When, a few minutes earlier, a nonbelieving visitor had accidentally knocked several copies of the religious periodical off a desk onto the floor and offered his courteous apologies, "I'm sorry," etc., to Lily, she smilingly answered:

"Why be sorry? It's wonderful."

Whether she was referring to the law of gravity or just life in general, she didn't specify.

But continuing on in reference to the postcard, she added that "Residents of China have his address, and it's the destination of travelers from Finland, Germany, Australia, South Africa, the Pacific coast, and other points throughout the world."

Apparently she liked to talk, and continued: "People have been talking about God for many years, but today, a God whom you can't see or never have any personal contact with just doesn't fill the bill. A promise of some home far beyond the clouds, with milk and honey flowing freely, really isn't what it takes to keep going down here, on terra firma. If God can't take care of me here and now, then how can I know or even believe He'll do so very much after I'm dead and gone?"

Senators, that quotation from Lily Dove, an "angel," shows a notable deviation from the Christian principles which are now being taught and which form the dominant religion in this country. As I pointed out, when there was a mongrelization in India and in Egypt, the first weakness was shown in the fact that there was a reversion from the dominant religion to the old barbaric, idolatrous religion which prevailed across the seas, whence the ancestors of the mongrels came. That was the first sign of decay. Here in this book we have quotations from the "angels" themselves, from Father Divine, "god" himself, telling what he professes and believes in; and those doctrines and principles are far removed from the dominant Christian religion which is now being practiced in civilized America. As I pointed out in the case of the other countries, the moment that sort of thing sets in—the moment you have a decay in religion you can expect mongrelization of the race and inevitably there follows decay of the civilization of the nation.

Her black, childlike countenance was deceiving. It brightened perceptibly now, as she became enthusiastic, almost inspired, about her leader, "Harlem is New York's hot spot, a melting pot where vice and crime are commonplace."

That is what she said. I am still quoting the "angel" now.

Truly, God knew where he was most needed. With the poorest housing conditions, hospitalization and educational facilities, an area where the ballot to this day hasn't even made first base, where churches, leagues, and welfare organizations haven't been able to bring about the necessary change, Father Divine has made life livable for countless thousands.

He's condescended—

She says—

to be as one with the seething masses, who have otherwise been forgotten, in their struggle for existence, and to see that they get the right to live and eat regularly. Now, all in all, I ask you, what more of a god do you want, than one who'll give you shelter, food to eat, clothes to wear, and freedom from sickness, worry, and fear? Now isn't that wonderful? And then to think he's made Harlem his home and receives his mail only a few doors up the street. It's truly wonderful, I say, don't you?"

Here is an expression from this "angel" which shows just what that faith is that is being taught by this "god"; the faith that is being followed as Father Divine's faith by 30,000,000 people, according to Father Divine, or, according to an estimate by uninterested writers, 2,000,000 to 5,000,000 people are following those teachings, as outlined by Lily Dove, who happens to be an "angel" and a very close adherent to Father Divine.

Mr. President, this illustrates that if Father Divine and his cult can keep on and get possession of one little group here, and of one little group there, and of another little group some place else, sooner or later the Senate is going to be asked to vote favorably upon bills to give to the Negro race social equality, for that is what they are after! Make no mistake about it! I propose to show to the Senate that this

principle is written in the platform of Father Divine himself. I shall read from that platform after a while.

Before I go any further in reading from this book, I want to exhibit to the Senate a picture of Father Divine. Here he is, in all his glory! Look at him! Here is "god!" [Laughter.] He is shown making a radio speech to his adherents, trying to get converts, I suppose. Does the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] see that picture? Here is Father Divine making a speech over the radio; mind you, "god" making a speech over the radio! I shall read the announcement he was making when this photograph was taken. Listen to it:

I have not yet done anything to what I will do—not so much as a percent of a percent of a percent of a fraction of a grain of what I will do universally, as well as among you.

I will read it again. Perhaps it was not understood, though I read it just as it is under the picture. This is Father Divine talking over the radio to his "angels," to his followers:

I have not yet done anything to what I will do—not so much as a percent of a percent of a percent of a fraction of a grain of what I will do universally, as well as among you.

Some of these days I am going to ask some one to tell me what that means. [Laughter.]

I continue reading from the book:

He's condescended to be as one with the seething masses, who have otherwise been forgotten, in their struggle for existence, and to see that they get the right to live and eat regularly. Now, all in all, I ask you, what more of a god do you want, than one who'll give you shelter, food to eat, clothes to wear, and freedom from sickness, worry, and fear? Now, isn't that wonderful! And then to think he's made Harlem his home and receives his mail only a few doors up the street. It's truly wonderful, I say, don't you?

As Jimmy Walker once so aptly answered, "Who could say 'No'?"

With practice Lily Dove could almost convert Satan.

Apparently both Harlem and the colored race are going to have a plethora of evangelistic orators following in the wake of Father Divine. Some of the younger among his followers, although apparently with little education, can already harangue and exhort an audience like experts. The black hope's chauffeur, known by the "angelic" name of "Mister Charlie," a gaunt, colored youth in his twenties, wearing an ordinary brown suit instead of his regular chauffeur's uniform, stood up in front of a crowd packed in the Sixty-third Street heaven and handled his listeners with the proficiency of an astute veteran.

He told them, "I heard Sister Freedom say tonight that we didn't have no plank in our Righteous Government platform about taxation and that we should adopt one. Well, I don't know anything about it, but I'm going to tell you what that plank will be."

One minute his audience was shaking the ex-armory with laughter, and the next minute there could be heard on every side, "That's Father talking through that lad," as the young orator told how—

Listen to this:

As the young orator told how "Father owned all the land in the whole world."

He was referring to Father Divine. This is what was said by the "lad", another "angel" who happened to be the chauffeur, a young man by the name of "Mr. Charlie," who had in his system a form of taxation which he wanted to give the world. Listen to what he said:

"Father owned all the land in the world and nobody hain't seen no pieces of paper with his name signed onto it selling the land to somebody else." He added that lots of people were coming around wondering "where Father git his money," and told his enthusiastic listeners that "Father, he got all the money in the Universe, but he ain't got a red cent on him."

Lighting into the politicians, he told of their shortcomings and how they had to put so many on relief because they didn't know their business, and, reaching his grand finale, he shouted:

"Father"—

That is, he is talking about Father Divine.

"Father, he gon'a drive all them crooks out of office. Maybe I'll be President."

That was his view—that he might be President. He is thinking about it.

And the way his audience laughed and applauded, maybe he would be, if they could have the say. Mister Charlie is said by some to have been a former Harlem gangster gambler and late representative of the policy game racketeers.

That is the history of Mr. Charlie, who is a chauffeur of "god," and who is now saying that maybe he is going to be President of the United States sooner or later.

I could continue reading from the life history and the views of this man who calls himself "god"—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend while the Senate receives a message from the President of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will not affect the Senator's right to the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I just said, I could continue reading about "Sister Bouquet" and some more about "Peaceful Mary," "Faithful Mary," "Mary Magdalene," and quite a number of others of these angelic figures who adorn the heavens in New York, probably in Indianapolis, here in Washington, and in other sections of the country, but I do not care to do so at this time. I ask Senators, and all others listening to me, including the correspondents in the press gallery, to read this book, which is very interesting. It shows what we would be headed for in this country should the Congress grant the various requests which are before us now, and others which will come just as surely as I am speaking and as certainly as there is snow on the ground outside of the Capitol Building today; that we would be headed for the same demoralization of civilization that has prevailed in India, Egypt, and Haiti, and which is now permeating certain South American countries, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, as well as France.

I do not want such a thing to come to pass in this country of ours, and as long as I am a Member of the Senate the white people of the United States can depend on the junior Senator from Louisiana to fight in every way he knows how, with all the power that is in him, for white supremacy as against an amalgamation of the races, or a mongrelization, which would lead to a deterioration of the country we all love so dearly.

I am going to skip quite a number of pages because of lack of time. The RECORD will show that I have an agreement with the Senate that I shall get through with my remarks today. However, I may say that I have enough data on my desk and around me to speak for a few more days—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator for a question; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator say that he is going to skip several pages?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will skip several pages of this book; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not the Senator afraid that if he does he will come within the recently invoked rule and lose the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I am not afraid of that. I am deliberately skipping several pages in this book. If I had not made what I consider an agreement with the Senate on yesterday that I would conclude my remarks today, I would be perfectly willing to keep on with this discussion until next week, if necessary, and I believe that I have sufficient material on hand to make this bill and other bills like it appear ridiculous, and to show what we are headed for if this country of ours were socially to recognize the Negroes of this Nation.

Oh, how I glory in the South for its fight for white supremacy!

Chapter 14 of this book is entitled "God Enters Politics." That is Father Divine. Here the Senate is going to have brought home to it what this son of a Negro slave from Georgia is preaching to his cult, and is attempting to shoulder onto the American people. He, by the way, is one who is being courted by politicians of the city and State of New York, and these politicians, in order to get support from his angels and his whole coterie, pretend to voluntarily rub elbows with him.

I read from page 236:

Speaking of politics and politicians and of his opponents who ridiculed the idea of "God entering politics," Father Divine declared:

"They have striven to keep the Christ completely out of politics, telling you God and religious people would not be in politics; in the corruptibility of the politicians and the wickedness of the wicked; He would not function in their expression—but He came among them to convert them. For this cause I am and have as much right in politics as I have in the church, and really I have more right in politics than I have in the church."

This is an expression from "god"; that he has more right, more interest, I suppose, in politics than he has in church, although he is "god."

On January 10, 11, and 12, 1936—

Listen to this. This appears on all of his stationery. Following 1936, in addition to using the usual "A. D."—"anno Domini"—he has added "F. D." He uses on his stationery "A. D. F. D."—"anno Domini Father Divine." He has gone so far as to stamp on his own literature and his own letters "A. D. F. D." Senators, think of it! Some Americans are actually following such foolishness, such an irreligious cult; following teachings that are bound to lead that cult to such a point where Christianity, although the dominant religion here, will be cast aside for the worship of onions, goats, elephants, chickens, doves, and so forth—

Father Divine's peace mission movement met in an international righteous government convention at St. Nicholas Palace in New York City and there established a platform, which is an expansion and detailed enlargement of the movement slogan, "One for all and all for one, but not for one who's not for all."

That is his slogan. I will read it again:

"One for all and all for one, but not for one who's not for all."

The politico-religious leader himself sent out personal invitations to the President of the United States, many Governors, Senators, Representatives, mayors, and other officials requesting their attendance. The following is a copy of his letter to President Roosevelt:

As I pointed out a while ago, Father Divine has been holding these hallelujah meetings to get his cult together throughout the country, and in order probably to get a large attendance, although he is "god," I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], he seeks, apparently, the highest in society, the highest in politics, so that he can get a crowd and get more present to join the cult. I want Senators to listen to the letter that he addressed to the President.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. In respect to his desire to have a crowd does Father Divine differ from the former leader in Louisiana, Senator Long?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has touched a very tender spot in my heart. I wish, sir, that I had but time to talk about Huey Long. I want to tell you, sir, that before this debate ends I propose to speak again, because, as I said yesterday, so far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he is going to remain on this floor as long as there is breath in him before that bill shall pass. I may have the opportunity to give Senators the history of the immortal Huey, a man whose name will go down in history when a good many of his critics will be forgotten before they are cold in the grave.

PEACE

January 6, 1936. A. D. F. D.—

Again "A. D. F. D." follows the 1936—

Special delivery. Registered air mail. Return receipt requested. Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, White House, Washington, D. C. Honorable sir—

Before I read from the letter itself it will be noted further on, as I said a while ago, that Father Divine at one of these meetings forgot to invite the Pope. He wanted the Pope at Rome to be there. And just to show that he is a real go-getter when it comes to trying to get a crowd, he wants big folks up there on the platform, the big white folks there to draw the crowd, and following that routine of business, in order to get the multitude there, he invites the big boys, not only the



President, but he includes the Governors, the Senators, the Representatives, and everybody else who might be significantly interested in his behavior.

I write as I wish to advise—

Speaks this "god" to the President of the United States—

I write as I wish to advise, I, Rev. M. J. Divine, my Peace Mission Movement and other Cooperating Organizations are representing righteousness, justice and truth, and have organized a righteous Government department in connection with our movement under the Constitution of the United States and in accord with same.

We are holding an International Righteous Government Convention on the tenth, eleventh and twelfth at the Rockland Palace, One Hundred and Fifty-fifth Street and Eighth Avenue, New York City, and the New Star Casino, One Hundred and Seventh Street, near Park Avenue, New York City, and also at the St. Nicholas Palace, 69 West Sixty-sixth Street, near Eighth Avenue, New York City, on January 10, 11, and 12.

We do hereby request the honor of your presence and any of your staff to speak on our program at any of these places on any date convenient to you.

I thank you in advance for your participation in the act of further establishing righteousness, truth, and justice for all humanity. I have sent out a general invitation to all of the leading classes of people through the New York Times, Monday the 6th, but, of course, we have sent out some special invitations to some that we consider might be interested in speaking in this great convention, and also to learn and know of our righteous government platform for which we stand, that all may be concerned might be even as I am—

Listen to this—

for this leaves me well, healthy, joyful, peaceful, lively, loving, successful, prosperous—

He must be prosperous when he has hundreds of colored followers who cling to him. I again ask the question, Where does he get the money to cement such loyalty? I think I can show that after a while.

Lively, loving, successful, and happy in spirit, mind, and body, and in every organ, muscle, sinew, vein, and bone, and even in every atom, fiber, and cell of my bodily form.

Respectfully and sincerely, I am,

Rev. M. J. DIVINE,  
(Better known as Father Divine.)

M.J.Dr.

That, Senators, is a letter that the President of the United States received from this "god" to attend this convention.

There is no record of the attendance of any important Government officials at the convention; but, in one form or another, a goodly number of them sent their regrets, and the local political organizations had their observers in attendance at the convention.

The first piece of business transacted by the convention was the approval of an extra-political resolution. A disciple arose and, after he had been recognized by Chairman Madison, stated—

Listen to this. Here was the convention, which had been called to order, and I am going to tell Senators what the first resolution was. I imagine they can guess what it was before I tell them. But, anyway, one of these "angels" got up and made this motion:

I move that Father Divine is god.

[Laughter.]

He was already "god," but it seems that at this meeting he wanted it affirmatively declared by his cult, so one of his angels got up and said to the cult in convention:

I move that Father Divine is god.

The chairman put the motion to the assemblage and called for a vote. There were no nays; the resolution was passed unanimously.

At the end of the 3 days a platform had been formulated and adopted. It was divided into four sections: (1) Principles, (2) Economic, (3) Political, and (4) Educational. Under each division the main plank, racial nondiscrimination, led a wide variety of tenets on many different subjects.

Quoting, "Of one blood God formed all nations," from the Bible, they pointed out in the platform that both the Scriptures and science attested the whole human race to be essentially one. They attacked the persecution of the Jews in Germany and elsewhere, and "the oppression of all minorities," and declared that the division of humanity into political nations had led to continuous warfare and widespread poverty and distress all through the ages. For this reason they refused to identify themselves with any nation or race, but stated that, "We do endorse and support the Constitution of the United States as the foundation for all government to build upon."

They demanded immediate legislation in every State—

Your particular attention to this. Here was the convention of this cult, dominated by Father Divine, in which this demand was made.

They demanded immediate legislation in every State and county making it a crime to discriminate in any public place against any individual on account of race, creed, or color.

That is in the platform of that cult. That is what they are working toward. They desire, as fast as they can get it, not only political equality but social equality; and that is what it is coming to. Here is a cult that is more or less powerful among a certain class of those easily persuaded, demanding that every State legislature pass a law, in effect, giving to their cult and to other members of their race social equality. That is what we are headed for unless America takes heed of the warning which I have been proclaiming to the Senate with all the earnestness of my being.

I read again:

They demanded immediate legislation in every State and county making it a crime to discriminate in any public place against any individual on account of race, creed, or color; also for abolishing all segregated neighborhoods, likewise all segregated schools and colleges, and all segregated areas and churches, theaters, public conveyances, and other public places. They also call for laws making it a crime for any newspaper, magazine, or other publication to use segregated or slang words referring to race, creed, or color of any individual or group. Other legislation in reference to discrimination by the civil service and employers in general was demanded, as were laws prohibiting different wage scales or salaries for "what they term different races, creeds, or color." The group also called for the abolition in all educational institutions and in all books used for educational purposes of all references to racial conflicts or differences and to national glory through military feats.

That is what that cult, led by the "almighty" Father Divine, "god," is preaching.

The immediate repeal of all laws in the United States and elsewhere that have been passed contrary to the spirit and meaning of the Constitution of the United States was directed. Likewise, the destruction by both nations and individuals of all firearms and instruments of war within their borders, except those actually needed for law enforcement.

They demanded the repeal of all laws providing for any form of compulsory insurance. The platform quoted Father Divine to the effect, "As far as taking out insurances, we will not tolerate it, and I would tell the President so"; and that if necessary they would break the law instead of taking out "insurance to mistrust God and visualize disappointments, failures, accidents, and disasters."

The abolishment of capital punishment in all States and counties was one of the planks adopted, and they demanded new legislation whereby—

Listen to this:

They demanded new legislation whereby the physician who takes charge of a patient must guarantee a complete cure and be liable for damages in the event of death.

Think of a thing like that being advocated by a cult here in America! Listen to it; let me bring its significance home to you in this bill:

Again the platform quoted Father Divine, "If for any cause my spirit—

This is "god" speaking from his platform—

"If for any cause my spirit and my mind and my impersonal presence cannot reach your afflicted or sick children or those that are concerned, and heal them, you can have a physician and should have one. But remember the physicians must guarantee the cure and guarantee the life and health of the individual. This is a law within a law, and I put it forth as a rebuttal to that of medical science.

Here we are going back to real voodooism as it is practiced in Africa. If I cannot reach the afflicted get a physician. Here is a part of a platform that is a challenge to medical science in this country and medical science in the world, with this country leading it, and here is a cult that has been permitted to prosper under colored domination and is advancing such ideas as I have been reading from this volume.

This is a law within a law, and I put it forth as a rebuttal to that of medical science. If they will try to bind mankind to their rulings, they must be subject to a ruling also \* \* \* the law is not worth a dime that is not giving equal rights on either side.

This is Father Divine speaking—

Thousands of people are homeless, thousands of them are motherless and fatherless, yea, even familyless. Whole families have died by operations. Whole families have been forced to have

physicians, and still they died after the physicians and hospitals had taken all their money. When the physician takes charge of you physically, he must guarantee your health and complete happiness and cure from that affliction and all of the diseases for which they are treating you.

There, Senators, is a passage I have read from what I will call the constitution of this cult, which defies medical science and says to a doctor, "If you are called in to cure a patient, you must guarantee that you are going to make him well. If you do not, we're going to charge you some damages."

How does Father Divine want to cure the sick? He does not say here; but I should be willing to wager that his method of doing it would be the same as was used by his forbears in dark Africa—by praying to a goat, or to an elephant, or perhaps rubbing the patient with a little bit of sweet oil or onion tops. [Laughter.] That may be what his teachings will lead to; and that is what this little colored man, who claims that his cult embraces 30,000,000 members in this country, is preaching to those members.

To the average reader the foregoing doctrine will probably seem the most radical and the most fantastic in the entire portfolio of this Don Quixotic crusader. However, here again Father Divine is much in agreement with Gandhi, who declares that "disease is the result of our thoughts as much as our acts"—

Gandhi, as you know, is a native of India. He is a great man in India. I will not say that he is considered a god, but he is considered some kind of a healer, a man who has the power of healing by a mere touch of the hand, and you are well. He can cure you overnight. Just touch his garments and you are cured. That is why I say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] that in India today there is a condition which clearly shows what the mongrelization of that once proud race has brought about in the way of the degradation and decay of its former great civilization; and I repeat that I do not want that to occur in this country.

I continue reading:

and that all disease springs from the same origin, the neglect of natural laws of health.

Romain Rolland, in his book, Gandhi, states:

"Western medical science is concerned with giving relief to suffering bodies only. It does not strive to do away with the cause of suffering and disease, which, as a rule, is nothing but vice. In fact, western medical science may almost be said to encourage vice by making it possible for a man to satisfy his passions and appetites at the least possible risk. It contributes, therefore, to demoralize people; it weakens their will power by helping them to cure themselves with 'black magic' prescriptions instead of forcing them to strengthen their character by disciplinary rules for body and soul."

The righteous-government group in their platform further demanded legislation providing that any labor union which limits the hours and days of work per week must guarantee at least that much work per week to its members, and, if it calls a strike, pay its members while they are out of work at the full rate.

That is fine business.

Once more they let their leader lay down the law to the unrighteous.

I again quote from this inimitable platform, or constitution, or whatever it may be called:

Practically all of the different unions they think they have dominion over the people, and force them to work or force them not to work and yet give them nothing. I have risen to put it down—

This is "god" talking—

Every union in the United States must deal justly among the people, or else I will strike on them.

Just think. If the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., or any other labor organization, fails to toe the mark, Father Divine is going to strike on it.

If you belong to a union, the unions must have a law to see that you get so much work, if you must pay your union dues. \* \* \* This country does not belong to the unions; it belongs to God.

Who is "God"? Father Divine. "Therefore," he reasons, "it belongs to me." And that is why that little chauffeur of his a while ago, "Mr. Charlie," advocated that ridiculous taxation plan, to relieve all property from taxation, because he said that all the sales that took place in the past were no good since Father Divine's name did not appear on the deeds.

Now tell them I said keep their hands off. \* \* \* Talking about a man cannot work unless he belongs to a union, and then joining

the union, and they will not give him work to do. \* \* \* If the labor unions that limit workers to 5 days a week will guarantee the workers 5 days' work each week and will guarantee to pay them what they are demanding from the employers when they call them out on strike, we will endorse them. Otherwise, we will not tolerate them.

The platform called for legislation abolishing lynching—

Here it is. This is what I referred to a while ago. Here is the platform. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is a coauthor of the pending bill. In order, I suppose, for him to get the support of Father Divine—I do not know; I am just stretching my imagination again—but I imagine that it will be necessary for this platform to be followed; otherwise, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], Father Divine is going to see that his "angels" and the members of his cult do not vote for the Senator from New York.

The platform called for legislation abolishing lynching and for outlawing members of lynch mobs in all States and countries.

Read the antilynching bill, and you will find that written in section 3, as it affects the officers of the law. Under the bill, if the officer fails to make every effort to catch the members of the lynch mob, he goes to jail or the penitentiary. Now, just notice:

The platform called for legislation abolishing lynching and for outlawing members of lynch mobs in all States and countries.

That is the platform, and that is the way the pending bill is written.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The Presiding Officer (Mr. LEWIS in the Chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not much time. I have only 35 minutes left. I wish I had time for a few more words. However, I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH. What is the date of the book from which the Senator is reading? When was it published?

Mr. ELLENDER. This book was published in 1936. The title of it is, "God in a Rolls-Royce"—

Mr. SMITH. Yes; he is still there.

Mr. ELLENDER. God in a Rolls-Royce—the Rise of Father Divine, by John Hoshor.

Father Divine later stated that every person who was a member of a lynch mob that kills a man should be classed as a murderer and punished as the law of the particular States punish murderers, and not only that, "but everyone who is known to participate in a mob violence should be classed and found guilty as a murderer, whatsoever that means."

Read the bill and compare it with that platform. Read it!

The platform quoted Father Divine as declaring that he fed many thousands each day free, but that that was not his great aim in life.

"This is not the greatest expression."

Again quoting from the platform.

The great expression, according to my version, is to help you to be independent. I will cut out so much feeding of the unemployed as I have been. I have opened ways and means whereby you can be independent, self-supporting, and self-respecting. That is what I am desiring to see you all do and be.

They demanded legislation prohibiting employment agencies from collecting fees or remuneration in any form from employees, and called for Government control of all idle plants and machinery, tools and equipment where the owners are unwilling to operate them at full capacity, such facilities to be made available to workers on a cooperative, nonprofit basis, under supervision of Government experts, with temporary provision from the Government for materials.

That is in the platform of Father Divine's convention, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

They also demanded immediate work, under Government supervision, for every unemployed worker.

Abandonment of the rule requiring individuals to be on the relief rolls in order to get work on relief projects was called for. Crop control—

That is a good plank in this platform. I agree to that. That is the first thing in the whole platform that I would sanction, so far—

Destruction of foodstuffs and other products, must stop—



Wait a minute; I spoke too soon. [Laughter.]

That is a good plank in this platform. I agree to that. Mr. SMITH. Oh, no; go on.

Mr. ELLENDER. It says, "Crop control \* \* \* must stop". I did not read it correctly.

According to the platform, which states, "The spectacle of hungry people in a land of plenty is worse than uncivilized." Abolition of all tariff schedules and obstacles to free trade among the nations formed another plank.

They asked for legislation limiting the amount of profits to be made on any article or product, but leaving the individual free to sell for as little as he chooses. Likewise, they want it made a criminal offense for any individual to spend money except for the necessities of life, while that individual owes a just debt to any person or organization. The platform pointed out that, "The followers of Father Divine will not owe another, and will not buy on the installment plan."

That is a mighty good platform plank. I wish they would stick to it. [Laughter.]

Father Divine evidently realizes that one of the greatest sources of worry and one of the most important factors in the weakening of character in our lives is that of living beyond our individual means. Father Divine, however, has completely annihilated this deleterious practice among his adherents, thereby adding measurably to their day-to-day happiness and peace of mind.

The righteous Government platform called for Government ownership and operation of the financial system and for all of the Government's bonded debts to be redeemed; all interest to be abolished, and dividends to be limited to 3½ percent. Receiving interest or larger dividends, or receiving money without performing labor or rendering practical service therefor, should be made a criminal offense.

As for counterfeit money, it should all be immediately destroyed by those who have acquired it at their own expense.

That is another plank in the platform.

The platform once again quoted Father Divine to the effect that if someone happens to pass a counterfeit bill on another, regardless of its amount, the latter should destroy it, for it is false, and the false should be eliminated.

There is to be no attempt to punish, but he should destroy it at his own expense.

Under the educational subdivision they called for the abolishing of the conventional form of greeting—

Listen to this. This is important, as I pointed out a while ago in connection with the article in Time:

Under the educational subdivision they called for the abolishing of the conventional form of greeting, "Hello," and the substitution of the word "Peace."

In other words, let me say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], if he should happen to telephone to Mrs. Smith here in Washington, instead of saying, "Hello, Mrs. Smith," he would have to say, "Peace, Mrs. Smith." [Laughter.] That is a part of the platform.

They requested the cooperation of the telephone companies in this respect, "that a generation with peace on its lips, instead of what war has been said to be, may come into being."

The platform further asserted that the "time is at hand for righteousness, justice, and truth to be legalized, and for those that are unrighteous, unjust, and untrue, and will not observe the righteousness of the law, to be designated as criminals."

Modestly they admitted "it is not claimed that the recommendations contained in this platform will solve every economic problem of the world at large," but they pointed out, "the fundamental principle will."

In establishing these principles they stated, "We will use the legal and political guns, but refuse to use those that are the expressers of destruction, for we are not conceivers of destructive ideas and opinions."

The strange political document ended with a prophecy that the trident standard shall be universally established and accepted as the fundamental by "every nation, language, tongue, and people."

Following the completion of the convention's business and its adjournment, a copy of the platform adopted was released to the newspapers. Also Father Divine again personally wrote the more important Government officials, political and other leaders, calling their attention to the platform and enclosing a copy thereof.

Although the Pope had not been invited to attend the convention, he was blessed with a copy of the platform, with the following letter from its protagonist:

This is a letter sent to the Pope; too late, however, for the Pope to come to New York and attend the convention, but in order that the Pope might not be slighted they sent him a copy of all the proceedings.

The letter was addressed:

Peace, January 21, 1936. A. D. F. D. (anno Domini Father Divine).  
Special delivery. Air mail. Registered mail.  
Return receipt requested.

He wanted to be sure that his holiness got the letter. I read:

Eminence, POPE PIUS XI,  
*The Vatican, Rome, Italy.*

YOUR GRACE: I write as I wish to advise, I, Rev. M. J. Divine, better known as Father Divine, and my peace mission movement, enclose the publication, *The Spoken Word*, that carries my message with the embodiment of my righteous government platform for which I stand, of which we drafted and released to the press and the public in our international righteous government convention on January 10-12.

We are not seeking to form another party, neither to run in collision with partisan parties that are in operation, but to release to them and to all that are in authority the high ideals for true partisanism that all parties might take the fundamentals in the text of my righteous government platform to serious consideration and act upon them as a significant legislation.

Please kindly accept same and endorse it, to be handed down to your congregations, as a significant legislation, and to be recommended by all of the Catholic people and in all countries under your spiritual advisory. This platform should be an important piece of legislation to be enacted in all of the government affairs through politics in connection with your advisory, for the purpose of abolishing vice and corruption in politics as well as in other organizations and for the establishment of a righteous government for which I have striven.

Therefore, we, the international interreligious, nonsectarian, interracial and nonpartisan peace mission and other cooperating and harmonious organizations, do hereby present this platform as a presentation from our righteous government department to you and to all that will accept same to stand as one body for the cause of righteousness, truth, and justice.

By your grace, endorsement, and cooperation, we will have righteous government throughout our great civilization, and all nations will unify together as one man at Jerusalem in peace and harmony by which we will have universal peace, instead of another world war. The conflicts and the threatening conflicts among the nations have caused the people of our present civilization to fear another great conflict as a world war, but we are requesting the honor of all good-thinking people to cooperate in thoughts and beseeches to the omnipotent, to bring about international peace among all nations in the repetition of the fulfillment of the message given to the wise men by the angels, whilst on their way to Bethlehem—"Glory to God in the highest and on earth, peace, good will toward men."

When this shall have been accomplished, by your grace and the cooperation of others, "the kingdom of this world shall become to be the kingdom of our God and his Christ," and the universal brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God will be a reality even as it is with those that are connected with me, that all may be even as I am.

Listen to this. He inserted the same closing paragraph as in the letter to the President of the United States. Let me read it, and I hope Senators will listen to it:

This leaves me well, healthy, joyful, peaceful, lively, loving, successful, prosperous and happy in spirit, body, and mind, and in every organ, muscle, sinew, vein, and bone, and even in every atom, fiber, and cell of my bodily form.

That is giving it to them, is it not, I ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH]?

Respectfully and sincere, I am, Rev. M. J. Divine (better known as Father Divine).

It will be remembered that a while ago I asked whether or not the platform from which I have read was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and my reason for asking the question was that there appears in this book the following paragraph:

According to Senator WAGNER's advice to Father Divine, Vice President Garner had had the Divine platform read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will not the Senator repeat that? I did not get it clear.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago I asked the clerk to check up and see whether or not this platform was ever printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and my reason for asking

was that in this book I noticed that there was a special paragraph reading as follows:

According to Senator WAGNER's advice to Father Divine, Vice President Garner had had the Divine platform read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a further question.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does the RECORD actually show?

Mr. ELLENDER. The RECORD shows that it was not read or published. I asked for the information of the clerk and a certain document was sent to me, which I did not read, but I am informed that the platform was not read, and that it was not made a part of the RECORD. That is my information.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. The book says the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] advised Father Divine that it had been printed. Is there anything to show that the Senator from New York read it or had it printed, or endeavored to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. Apparently not. I asked whether or not the document was made a part of the RECORD so that I could check up with the paragraph I have just read, and I was informed that it was not published or read.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Is Father Divine one of the advocates of the pending bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Is he! I claim that everything in the bill, even to the provision for the prosecution of the officer, and the punishing of the persons who are part of the mob, is provided in terms like those found in this book. Let me read it again. I read from page 243.

The platform called for legislation abolishing lynching and for outlawing members of lynch mobs in all States and countries. Father Divine later stated that every person who was a member of a lynch mob that kills a man should be classed as a murderer and punished as the laws of the particular States punish murderers, and not only that "but everyone who is known to participate in a mob violence should be classed and found guilty as a murderer, whatsoever that means."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It has been frequently charged on the floor of the Senate that someone is in the gallery leading this fight. Is Father Divine in the gallery leading the fight?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know, but I would be willing to wager that a few "angels" might be found in this audience. [Laughter.] For all I know, the angel "Mary Magdalene" might be facing the Senate, or probably "Sister Bouquet," another one of the angels, or perhaps "Faithful Mary," who wrote the green book from which I read, might be in the gallery. I may be wrong about that, but the Senator has asked the question, and I have answered it to the best of my ability; and on occasions I have had to stretch my imagination a little. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Is the Senator complaining of the fact that what he calls a platform was sent to the Congress of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I am not. My only reason for asking that the clerk check the matter and find out whether or not the platform was placed in the RECORD was that this paragraph appeared in the book. I, of course, have no objection to the platform being printed in the RECORD if certain Senators want it printed. I do not care about that. My only reason for having the matter checked was that I might find

out whether the statement contained in the paragraph I just read was carried out.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. The Senator believes in the first amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly I do.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. So the Senator is not attempting to cast any reflection upon the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] or the Vice President of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; not in the least. I would not have mentioned the matter in the course of the debate had not a question been asked me by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I asked the clerk to let me know whether the platform had been made a part of the RECORD. Instead of reading the platform from the book I would have read it as it was printed in the RECORD had it been placed there. That is why I asked the clerk to check up on it. Of course, when the Senator from Texas asked me, after I had read the paragraph, to read it again, I did read it again.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask him a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I just wanted to make sure that the Senator was not complaining because of the compliance with the provisions of the first amendment of the Constitution, which guarantees the rights of citizens to petition their Government.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not complaining of that, I will say to the Senator from Washington. But, I repeat, my idea was to quote the platform from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question. I may state to the Senator that I agreed to try to wind up at 5 o'clock, but I doubt if I will be able to wind up at 5 o'clock.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator stays wound up. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not a question of the Senator remaining wound up. He is already wound up and ready to go; much more power remains.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to be fair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], and to the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is not here. Is the Senator aware that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of recent date appears the following:

The Vice President laid before the Senate a resolution of the International Righteous Government Convention remonstrating against war, the sale or manufacture of war materials in the United States, and the loan of money to any warring nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was not aware of that, I will say to the Senator from Texas, but what the Senator is now reading from is not the platform about which I read a while ago. It is a totally different proposition.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If Father Divine is God, why does he not stop wars instead of "resolving" against them?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I would like to know. I continue to read on page 251:

Father Divine is emphatic that his group are not interested in forming another party. Although he and his followers supported La Guardia in the 1933 New York City mayoralty campaign, he is apparently more in accord with the doctrines of the Communist Party than with those of any other political organization. He has often cooperated with the Communist group in their peace parades and meetings, and once, denying a rumor that Moscow financed the Peace Mission Movement, the colored messiah stated that to the contrary he had at times helped the Communists financially.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask, If Father Divine is God, is there any evidence to show who his representative is down here?



Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose he ought to have a few angels in Washington, because he has 60 heavens in Washington, 24 States, and 4 countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Sixty heavens! [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The book says that he has 60 heavens in Washington, 24 States, and 4 countries, and I am told that they are all filled with fluttering angels. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Fluttering angels! [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. All lively too. I have been informed—I may be wrong, and if so, I will correct it later on in the Record—that the angels are the collectors. They are compelled to give the collections of all they make to Father Divine. That is how he gets the mazuma. [Laughter.]

I continue reading because I want to complete my statement this afternoon. I know I cannot complete my speech by 5, but I will try. [Laughter.]

I continue to read:

Speaking of political parties, Father Divine declared: "The party or parties which desire my support, tell them I said, 'Give me something better than the Communists offer.' This is what I say; but, remember, this is not confined to the Communist Party, neither the Democrats, Republicans, nor Socialists, for I have brought to the surface something better than the Communists offer."

That is Divine's platform. That is "god" speaking.

I have something—and I am something—better than the Communists offer. And better than all of the partisan parties.

Several Senators have recently come into the Chamber. There are more Senators present now than before. I do not suppose they heard some of the things I have read. I wish to let those Senators know exactly what absurdities this "god" has been spreading over the radio. Here is a picture of him talking over the radio. I do not know what the language under the picture means, but I am going to read it again, and I am going to ask some Senator, on his own time, of course, not on mine [laughter], to tell me what this means. Listen to this. This is Father Divine talking. Look at him—his mouth is wide open, near the microphone:

I have not yet done anything to what I will do—not so much as a percent of a percent of a percent of a fraction of a grain of what I will do universally, as well as among you.

I shall reread that.

I have not yet done anything to what I will do—not so much as a percent of a percent of a percent of a fraction of a grain of what I will do universally, as well as among you.

If that is not English gone haywire, I want to know what it is. [Laughter.]

I read further.

Asked another time about his cooperation with the Communists, Father Divine replied:

"I stand for anyone who will deal justly between man and man. The Communists stand for social equality—"

There it is—"The Communists stand for social equality."

The Communists stand for social equality, political and economic equality, and for justice in every issue, and this is the principle for which I stand. I am not especially representing religion. I am representing God on earth among men and I will cooperate with any organization that will stand for the right and deal justly. . . . I know the higher-ups are oppressing the people and I will end this by righteousness, not by violence. I find fault with the Communist methods, but not their aims. I teach peace. There will be an end to all oppression and suppression and race prejudice, and I will bring it about personally.

Mr. President, that is "god" speaking. That is Father Divine speaking.

The Communist Party stands for social equality, political equality, economic equality, and I, God, with all my angles, believe in that.

Of course they do. Just as surely as I am speaking to the Senate, if we give political equality to the colored race that will happen to us of which I am now going to read. I am not alone in my prediction. I quote in substance from Jefferson, from Lincoln, and many of those of older civilizations. Listen, Senators:

Political equality leads to social equality, and social equality will eventually spell the decay and downfall of our American civilization.

That is what is coming. I repeat what I said earlier today. As far as ALLEN ELLENDER, junior Senator from Louisiana, is concerned, he would be willing to vote tomorrow for the repeal of the fifteenth amendment granting the Negro suffrage, because if all States of the Union give political equality to the colored people, leaders like "god," and others in those cities, who control a little clique of voters here, and another over there will seek more and more social equality, and what I am warning of will come to pass. Senators sitting here may not see it. My boy may not see it. No one in this audience may see it. But I am speaking now for future generations and for the progress of America. I do not want America to stagnate. I do not want it to go backward. I want it to progress. And I say, just as truly as I am speaking to the Senate, if we permit the mongrelization of the American race with the colored people, we will have the decay of our American civilization.

I repeat, Senators, I do not want the South again to experience conditions similar to those that she suffered following the Civil War. I do not want Federal soldiers, colored soldiers, to tramp the streets of New Orleans and try to make the white people in the State of Louisiana take their medicine." We are able to handle our local affairs, and will, too!

Mr. President, I have a few more facts to introduce. I have presented a picture to the Senate, and I hope to the American people.

I do not want to try to create any sentiment which may lead to trouble. I sympathize and always have sympathized with the colored people of the South. I like them. If in the past a few of them have been lynched, I say that at such times those who have done so have been led by the same class of people who commit murder in Chicago, in Baltimore, or in New York.

I do not know whether this bill is going to pass or not. I hope it does not. In fact I know it will not if I can keep on talking a little bit longer. We might talk it sick or talk it to death. We might just talk it out of business, in other words. [Laughter.]

So far as I am concerned, I wish to do my share in defeating it, and I am willing to continue speaking until tomorrow if necessary, and the day after that. I am going to keep on exerting every effort. As I said yesterday, so far as I am concerned, I do not want this bill to stand in the way of any necessary legislation. Personally, I should be willing to set this bill aside today or tomorrow and take up other legislation, and then come back and go to the bat on it after we finish the other legislation. That is what I am willing to do. I do not know how other Members of the Senate who are interested in this matter feel about that, but that is what I am willing to do.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, it is now 5 o'clock. I think I can get through in 10 or 15 minutes, and I ask the Senate's indulgence for that additional time. Several Senators have interrupted me for the purpose of asking questions. If those questions had not been asked perhaps I might have completed my speech by 5 o'clock as per an understanding with the Senate. I am now willing to rest the case, as we sometimes say in court.

I should like later to talk just a little bit more, however, and try, if I can, to bring some additional enlightenment to bear on the subject.

The next thing I should like to talk about, if it is necessary and if I may present all the facts, is to show what the South has done in order to help the Negro of the South economically and in every other way except to permit him social equality with the whites. I venture to say that we are doing just as much as, if not more than, any other part of the country in that respect.

Mr. President, as I have just said, while awaiting the disposition of the bill before it shall come to a vote, I desire to submit to the Senate seven separate amendments. I may have a few more later on, but for the present I have seven.

The first amendment I am not going to read, and I am not going to attempt to talk about it, except to say that the purpose of it is to prevent the marriage of a Negro with a

white, or a white with a Negro, in any State of the Union. I ask that this amendment be printed following my remarks, and that a copy of it be laid on the desk of each Member of the Senate; and I make the same request about each of the other amendments I am about to mention.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest to the Senator that he defer having the amendments printed until he is ready to conclude his remarks. Otherwise, some Senator may prevent him from concluding them.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am about ready to conclude my remarks. I want to fulfill my promise to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON] to conclude my remarks at 5 o'clock. I have just a few more words to say, and then I shall surrender the floor.

That is the first amendment.

If that should happen to fail, the next amendment is to the effect that if one State of the Union, or a number of States of the Union, happen to have statutes preventing the intermarriage of white and colored persons, such couples married in other States that permit it shall not be permitted to come into the States where such marriages are prohibited.

If that amendment fails, I have still another amendment to prevent marriages in the District of Columbia between Negroes and whites, or whites and Negroes.

Then I have a series of amendments, three in number, which are in a measure self-explanatory. They provide that if any damages are otherwise payable under this bill as the result of a lynching, if the facts show the person who was lynched was guilty of the crime he was accused of committing, his heirs or next of kin cannot recover. I have three amendments of that kind which I should like to offer. I ask that all of them be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the various amendments referred to by the Senator from Louisiana will be printed at the end of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BONE. I was wondering if the amendment which the Senator tenders, preventing the heirs of the deceased from recovering in case of his guilt, would not amount to trying a man for a crime after he is dead.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; under the bill, the damages are payable to the heirs or next of kin of the deceased; and my amendment states that if the facts show that the deceased, the man who was lynched, was guilty of the crime he was supposed to have committed, there shall be no responsibility.

Mr. BONE. Would not that imply trying a man after he is dead, or trying the facts of the case after he is dead?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not mean trying the man, Mr. President; I mean if the facts show that the person accused of the crime that led to his lynching was guilty, there shall be no recovery of damages.

The next amendment I offer is one making it a capital offense for any person to commit the crime of rape.

(The amendments referred to are printed at the end of Mr. ELLENDER's remarks.)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am about to close, but I yield for a question.

Mr. CONNALLY. In connection with the question of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], is it not a fact that it is not a matter of criminal prosecution in the sense that a dead man is being tried, but a question of civil liability which this bill seeks to set up, not between the dead man and the county or the municipality, but between the heirs of the dead man and the county or the municipality. Therefore, being a question of civil liability, any question that is pertinent to it may be elucidated and tried without the presence of the dead man.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. President, it is now 5:15 o'clock and, pursuant to my promise, I now desire to try to close my remarks.

As I stated a while ago, I hope Senators will not impose this bill on the South. I hope that what happened during reconstruction days will not again happen down there. I contend that if the Federal Government had maintained the Negroes of the South in power, today we might have a good start on the mongrelization of our race.

Suppose the strong hand and the long arm of the Federal Government had remained in the South, had permitted the colored people to have and to hold our chief offices there. Can you not visualize what would have happened? I hope my warnings, my arguments, will not fall on deaf ears, not only for the good of the Negro, but for the advancement of our progressive civilization.

O Mr. President, but for the foresight, but for the valor, but for the bravery, but for the courage of the white men and the white women of the South who, following the Civil War, fought for the supremacy of their race, and whose bodies now lie beneath the sod of the old South in dreamless sleep, these walls might never have echoed the voices of John Bankhead, Edward Douglas White, Isom Harris, Joseph T. Robinson, Duncan Fletcher, Oscar Underwood, the immortal Huey P. Long, Charles Culberson, Nathan Bryan, Donaldson Caffery, Ollie M. James, Hugo Black, Benjamin H. Hill, Wade Hampton, Zebulon B. Vance, L. Q. C. Lamar, Thomas S. Martin, and other illustrious sons of the South, including our esteemed and beloved Vice President and Presiding Officer, John Nance Garner.

The struggle was costly; it was bitter; but oh, how sweet the victory! Let us not reward the deeds of those men and women with a crown of thorns, but, instead, let us perpetuate their memories with this challenge, "We shall at all cost preserve the white supremacy of America."

(The amendments referred to by Mr. ELLENDER in his speech, and intended to be proposed by him to the pending bill, are as follows:)

#### NO. 1

On page 11, after line 23, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 7. It shall be unlawful for any white person to marry a Negro, or for any Negro to marry a white person. Any person who violates the provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, and the marriage shall be null and void."

#### NO. 2

On page 11, after line 23, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 7. It shall be unlawful for any husband and wife, being of different races, to enter any State, if under the laws of such State it is unlawful for the members of such races to intermarry. Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$ or imprisonment for not more than — years, or both."

#### NO. 3

On page 11, after line 23, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 7. It shall be unlawful for any white person to marry a Negro, or for any Negro to marry a white person, in the District of Columbia. Any person who violates the provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both, and the marriage shall be null and void."

#### NO. 4

On page 11, line 4, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "except as provided in subsection (3) of this section."

"(3) Any judgment or award recovered under the provisions of subsection (1) of this section shall be subject to any judgment claim against the victim of the lynching or the estate of the victim of the lynching, if such judgment claim was obtained by the holder thereof as a result of a suit against such victim for damages for personal injuries resulting from the death or injury of any person."

On page 11, line 5, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)."

#### NO. 5

On page 9, line 7, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "If the person injured, or the next of kin of the person injured in cases where the injury results in death, establishes that such person was not guilty of the offense which he was charged with or of which he was suspected."

On page 9, line 8, after the word "any," insert "such."

#### NO. 6

On page 7, line 16, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided further, That 'lynching' shall not be deemed to include the killing or maiming of any person



unless such person was not guilty of the offense with which he was charged or of which he was suspected."

NO. 7

On page 11, after line 9, insert the following new section:  
 "Sec. 6. Any male person who commits rape upon any female person shall be guilty of a capital crime and, upon conviction in the United States district court for the district in which the offense occurred, shall be put to death in the manner provided by law. Any male person who attempts to rape a female person shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction in the United States district court for the district in which the offense occurred, shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 5 years and not more than 15 years."

On page 11, line 10, strike out "Sec. 6" and insert "Sec. 7."

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, before the Senate takes a recess, I again express the hope that I may have the floor tomorrow to discuss the pending bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi how long his remarks will take. I understand that our legislative week will close tomorrow, and before the week ends I am very anxious to answer the speech made a day or two ago by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on the T. V. A. I am wondering whether, if I can get the floor after the Senator from Mississippi concludes his remarks, I will be able to make the speech this week.

Mr. BILBO. I am not yet a filibuster, and I do not expect to take more than 3 or 4 hours in a discussion of the pending bill, so the Senator will have plenty of time tomorrow.

#### SAFETY IN DRIVING ON THE HIGHWAYS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, on January 17, last Monday, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I offered an amendment to House bill 8838, which has to do with safety in driving on the highways of the United States. In the first session of the Seventy-fifth Congress I introduced a bill on the same subject, Senate bill 589, which is now on the calendar of the Senate.

Last Monday evening the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] participated in an interview over the radio in reference to safety on the highways, and I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that there also be printed, at the conclusion of the interview, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona and myself to House bill 8838.

There being no objection, the interview and amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO INTERVIEW WITH HON. CARL HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA, BY RUSSELL E. SINGER, GENERAL MANAGER OF THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION, MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1938

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. again evidences its interest in the traffic safety problem. Tonight we present an interview with Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, one of the outstanding congressional supporters of adequate and safe highways. Senator HAYDEN will be interviewed by Russell E. Singer, general manager of the American Automobile Association, who speaks for motorists.

Before going into the interview, let's hear from Mr. Singer as to just how serious the traffic-safety problem in the United States really is. Mr. Singer.

Mr. SINGER. A preliminary survey, just completed by the American Automobile Association, indicates that 39,243 men, women, and children were killed in traffic accidents on our streets and highways during 1937. More than 1,374,000 people were injured. This means that roughly 1 out of every 125 persons was killed or more or less seriously injured in highway crashes during the year just ended. The situation was particularly acute on rural highways where the traffic accident situation was much worse than in cities. Available records indicate that the great majority of accidents occurred in daylight hours and under favorable weather conditions. The greater number were directly attributable to careless acts on the part of drivers and pedestrians. In a word, the tragedy of carelessness continues to stalk along the streets and highways of the country.

Fortunately, we have with us tonight a United States Senator, who has been a leader in the effort to give our people a national system of highways and to assure their safe use. Senator HAYDEN has kindly consented to give the radio audience some information on the attitude in Congress with reference to the acute traffic-safety condition. Let's ask him some questions.

Senator HAYDEN, what do you think of our traffic accident situation?

Senator HAYDEN. Too many Americans apparently accept traffic accidents as inevitable. They do not see that the tremendous toll of deaths and injuries is the sum total of many millions of individual acts of thoughtlessness and indifference. Automobiles have become so commonplace that many people fail to realize that the increasing advantages of their use are seriously threatened by a tidal wave of national carelessness. Aside from the death toll and the tragedy that comes to our people when some loved one is killed or injured there is an economic aspect to the traffic safety problem.

Almost 6,000,000 people are employed directly or indirectly in highway transportation. They range from the men who build cars to attendants at gasoline pumps and garage workers. Obviously if car ownership and use is discouraged through our failure to eliminate the causes of accidents, the stability of one of America's first industries is threatened. As a people to whom the automobile has become a daily necessity, we must make every reasonable effort to achieve the maximum of highway safety if we are to continue to enjoy this cheap and rapid means of getting from place to place.

Mr. SINGER. Senator, do you believe that the Federal Government should itself attempt to solve this problem?

Senator HAYDEN. Absolutely not. Control of automobile traffic and supervision over drivers is essentially a State and local problem. But the Federal Government can and should help. Congress can assist and encourage the States to take action. It can be done in much the same fashion as the Federal Government has helped the States in the construction of roads. As you know, practically all highways are built by the several States. Yet the Federal Government, through the Bureau of Public Roads, acts as a central medium of exchange so that every State may have the benefit of new developments in every other State. The Federal Aid Highway Act authorizes the Bureau of Public Roads to set up certain engineering standards which the States must meet before they can receive grants of Federal funds for the construction of public highways, with the result that we are beginning to have a fairly satisfactory system of roads connecting at State borders to form a truly national network of hard-surfaced highways. In a similar manner the Federal Government can correlate the findings and experiences in the various States as they each attempt to work out their traffic problems, and by an interchange of information the Bureau of Public Roads could materially assist all the States in the promotion of traffic safety.

Mr. SINGER. I am certain that we can all agree with you on that, Senator HAYDEN. Could you tell us what is being done in Congress to promote traffic safety?

Senator HAYDEN. A number of sound proposals are being advanced in the Congress to meet the safety problem. As one approach, I might say that Senator TRUMAN, of Missouri, and I have today introduced an amendment to the Federal Highway Act which provides that after the 1st of January 1940 no State shall receive Federal aid for the construction of roads unless the legislature of that State has enacted a five-point program looking to uniform motor-vehicle laws throughout the United States. In other words, States without reasonable safety legislation would be denied Federal funds for road building.

We may as well face the fact that with nearly 30,000,000 motor vehicles on our highways, and the traffic situation as complicated as it is today, every State should not fail to require that an applicant for permission to drive must show that he has the ability to drive. We must also recognize that the use of our streets and highways for motor vehicles is not a right guaranteed by the Constitution but a privilege to be enjoyed when such use does not endanger the life and property of citizens generally.

It took the brains of many hundreds of men to invent and perfect the automobile. The startling increase of traffic fatalities now requires that millions of men should use their brains for their own protection and the protection of their fellow men. Those who will not or cannot exercise the common sense which God has given most of us must be compelled to do so either by guidance or punishment administered by the local authorities in our States and cities.

It is difficult to believe that while we have now had automobiles for nearly 40 years many States still permit anyone, regardless of his physical or mental fitness, to operate with abandon a killing machine weighing 3,000 pounds and capable of traveling up to 100 miles an hour. Eight States have no drivers' license law of any kind. Sixteen of the States which do have licenses cheerfully issue them to lunatics, habitual drunkards, and narcotic addicts. Is it any wonder that traffic accidents are on the increase?

Mr. SINGER. Would the method you and Senator TRUMAN have in mind mean further appropriations by Congress or perhaps the establishment of additional Government bureaus?

Senator HAYDEN. No; it is not necessary that any new Federal standards be set up with which the States must comply. Three decades of experience have helped to develop a uniform motor-vehicle code as a pattern for sound safety legislation in the States. There is no need for Congress to hand down a pronouncement, since this code has already been devised and perfected by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety in which the American Automobile Association was an active participant.

Every part of the uniform code has been adopted in one or more of the States. It offers a reasonable plan for the control of vehicles and drivers and even specifies what should be expected of the pedestrian. It is a model, simple in language and requirements, which the States can and should accept. All the States will adopt the code, I am sure, if Congress will encourage its enactment by the passage of such legislation as that which Senator TRUMAN and I have proposed.

Mr. SINGER. Senator HAYDEN, would you be kind enough to give the radio audience some indication of what the uniform code provides?

Senator HAYDEN. Certainly. The uniform code embodies five separate State laws, each dealing with a different field of motor-vehicle regulation. The first act establishes a uniform registration, certificate of title, and antitheft law, which would be of immeasurable assistance in connection with the administration of the existing Dyer Act, prohibiting the interstate transportation of stolen motor vehicles.

Another part of the code deals with the licensing of persons operating motor vehicles and sets up a standard for the examination of applicants for the right to drive. Were this portion of the code generally enacted it would not be true, as it is today, that only eight States require a test of vision before a license is issued. The third proposal relates to civil liability of owners and operators of motor vehicles, and provides for service of civil process on nonresidents.

The fourth suggested act pertains to the giving of proof of financial responsibility by owners and operators of motor vehicles. This would go a step further than a license law by giving the States a weapon for removing from the highways the proven reckless and irresponsible drivers. The final act regulates traffic on the highways, defines certain requirements in the use and operation of motor vehicles, provides for standard signs and signals. In general, it is a model regulation for controlling traffic.

Mr. SINGER. What you have said about the uniform acts is very interesting, and I am sure their enactment would go a long way toward solving many of our traffic problems.

Senator HAYDEN. The code is probably not perfect, but it is a long step in the right direction. If nothing else, it would help to wake up the American people to the horrible toll of human life which is being annually sacrificed because of our carelessness and our indifference—a loss that is worse than war.

Mr. SINGER. Perhaps it would be well, Senator HAYDEN, if you would compare the annual loss of life through automobile accidents in the United States with the number of Americans killed in the World War.

Senator HAYDEN. Most Americans are shocked by the ruthlessness of the dictators who by fear control those subject to them, and who have so often shown that they are callous to human suffering with little or no regard for human life. Yet we, the American people, have nothing to be proud of in that same respect. You have said, Mr. SINGER, that in 1937 more than 39,000 men, women, and children died as the result of accidents on our streets and highways. That figure exceeds the total number of American soldiers who were killed in battle in France in 1917 and 1918. Nearly 40,000 dead, and that slaughter by autos and trucks will go on—not in one war but year after year—unless more is done to stop it.

What I now say is no palliation of war, which always was and always will be cruel and brutal. The whole Nation is quickly aroused with righteous anger when death comes to an American soldier or sailor from the bullet or bomb of an enemy, yet we are apparently indifferent, or at least only momentarily concerned, when death strikes the larger numbers who travel our highways and streets.

Life is just as sweet to the little child who is struck by a truck as it was to the soldier in the Argonne Forest. Life is just as dear to the men and women who are crushed and burned beyond recognition in head-on automobile collisions as it was to the sailors who were drowned when their ship was torpedoed in the icy waters of the North Atlantic.

Some say that war is man-made, and therefore hateful, but the automobile is man-made and men drive them. From the point of view of the whole American people, one life is just as precious as another. The truth is that we are all very easily aroused over the horrors of war and too little alive to the greater number of tragedies on our streets and highways. There are millions of men who would willingly give their lives for their country. Anyone should rather voluntarily make such a supreme sacrifice than be killed by a drunken driver.

Mr. SINGER. Thank you very much, Senator, for your highly constructive presentation on a most important subject. We all realize, of course, that there is no royal road to safety. The problem must necessarily be attacked on a broad front. There must be cooperation between the Federal and State Governments—between the judiciary and law-enforcement agencies. Finally, and most important, there must be cooperation on the part of motorists and pedestrians. Everyone is gratified to know, Senator HAYDEN, that the Congress is actively interested in doing everything possible to encourage the States to adopt sound laws which have undergone the acid test of experience and found to be reasonable and helpful. We hope that other leaders in Congress will show the same interest that you have; and I am sure that I speak for motorists everywhere, as well as the American Automobile Association, when I say that you will have full cooperation.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. TRUMAN to the bill (H. R. 8838) to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, viz: On page 8 strike out lines 7 to 16, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 12. No sums appropriated after January 1, 1940, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be paid to any State unless

such State has enacted and has in force laws with respect to (1) motor vehicle registration, certificates of title, and theft; (2) motor vehicle operator's and chauffeur's licenses; (3) civil liability of owners and operators of motor vehicles; (4) financial responsibility of owners and operators of motor vehicles; and (5) regulation of traffic on highways; and such laws are found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be adequate to control properly the use of highways constructed in such State with the aid of funds apportioned to such State under the provisions of such Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented."

#### RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT OF ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, as follows:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Concurrent Resolution 24, first session, Seventy-fifth Congress, passed on August 21, 1937, requesting a report in January 1938, I am transmitting herewith a report on Alaska—Its Resources and Development, prepared at my request as one of a series of regional planning studies by the National Resources Committee.

The report is in two parts. Part I contains a statement on policy and recommendations for planning prepared by a special Alaska Resources Committee. Part II contains a series of staff reports prepared by groups representing different Federal Bureaus primarily concerned with various problems in Alaska. In order that these proposals and the supporting data may be available to the Members of Congress and to interested citizens, I recommend that the report be printed, with illustrations.

In the very limited time available for this study, a substantial beginning has been made toward "a comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of the Territory of Alaska."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 1938.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair), as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a convention, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### RECESS

Mr. MINTON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 21, 1938, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 20 (legislative day of January 5), 1938*

#### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for terms of 2 years from January 22, 1938 (reappointments):

Jesse H. Jones, of Texas.

C. B. Merriam, of Kansas.

Charles B. Henderson, of Nevada.

Emil Schram, of Illinois.

Howard J. Klossner, of Minnesota.

#### CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Warren T. Hannum, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission vice Col. John J. Kingman, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, relieved.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Robert A. Cooper, of South Carolina, to be United States district judge for the district of Puerto Rico. (Judge



Cooper is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 24, 1938.)

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Clinton R. Barry to be United States attorney for the western district of Arkansas. (Mr. Barry is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 31, 1938.)

Lawrence S. Camp, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia. (Mr. Camp is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

John D. Clifford, of Maine, to be United States attorney for the district of Maine. (Mr. Clifford is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 31, 1938.)

James O. Carr, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of North Carolina. (Mr. Carr is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

Marcus Erwin, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina. (Mr. Erwin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

Powless W. Lanier, of North Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of North Dakota. (Mr. Lanier is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

Emerich B. Freed, of Ohio, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Ohio. (Mr. Freed is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

William R. Smith, Jr., of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas. (Mr. Smith is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

Daniel B. Shields, of Utah, to be United States attorney for the district of Utah. (Mr. Shields is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 19, 1938.)

#### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

George A. Meffan, of Idaho, to be United States marshal for the district of Idaho. (Mr. Meffan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

Kinloch Owen, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 19, 1938.)

William B. Fahy, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri. (Mr. Fahy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

Charles R. Price, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the western district of North Carolina. (Mr. Price is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 19, 1938.)

Ford S. Worthy, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina. (Mr. Worthy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 19, 1938.)

George J. Keinath, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio. (Mr. Keinath is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 31, 1938.)

James R. Wright, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Texas. (Mr. Wright is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

Gilbert Mecham, of Utah, to be United States marshal for the district of Utah. (Mr. Mecham is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 19, 1938.)

Albert A. Sanders, of Wyoming, to be United States marshal for the district of Wyoming. (Mr. Sanders is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 26, 1938.)

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Chaplain (First Lt.) Morris Eugene Day, Chaplains' Reserve, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant, with rank from date of appointment.

#### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Maj. Charlie Anthony Valverde, Infantry, with rank from August 1, 1935.

Capt. Edwin Bascum Kearns, Jr., Infantry, with rank from August 1, 1935.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

##### MEDICAL CORPS

*To be captains with rank from December 17, 1937*

First Lt. Joseph Pease Russell, Medical Corps.

First Lt. Elmer Deloss Gay, Medical Corps.

First Lt. Erling Severre Fugelso, Medical Corps.

First Lt. Paul Alexander Paden, Medical Corps.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1938

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O God, for the assurance that Thou art present and that Thou art a rewarder of them that diligently seek Thee. Heavenly Father, from time immemorial the human heart has turned to Thee for help, sympathy, and guidance; may we wait at Thine altar. Blessed Lord and Master, keep us faithful to ourselves, our homes, our fellow men, and our Nation. We thank Thee for Thy Holy Word—the Book of wisdom, the Book of love, and the Book of God. Let us harken unto its appeal:

*I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.*

In the name of our holy Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, another letter has come to the committee of which I am chairman answering the Acting Comptroller General in reference to his criticism in his annual report. This letter comes from the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Members on both sides of the aisle feel that as the criticism of the Acting Comptroller General was published in the RECORD, his reply ought to be published in the RECORD.

If the House will not object, I ask unanimous consent to place the reply in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by Judge Henry Ellenbogen, a former Member of the House, on the date he resigned from the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the pending tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, by request of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution on the death of Judge Hill, former member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an article written by John W. Kelley in answer to an article that recently appeared in one of the New York papers criticizing Congressmen. This is a defense of the work of Congressmen.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8993) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8993, the Navy Department appropriation bill, 1939, with Mr. THOMASON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 4 hours and 9 minutes; the gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 3 hours and 46 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as I read this morning's Washington Post, my eyes fell upon the column written by Mr. Nelson Bell covering the theater. In this column appeared the following statement:

There are questions of pseudo-diplomatic relationships, managerial policy, and divers and sundry other considerations involved, with which this department has no inclination to lock horns. The maintenance of world equilibrium—such as it is—happily does not fall under the incumbent duties of this column.

But the fact of the matter is that the new issue of the March of Time, originally scheduled as a particularly provocative "added attraction" on the bill opening tomorrow at RKO-Keith's, will not be shown in Washington. This decision was handed down by the "high command" late yesterday afternoon, following the ban of the issue in Chicago—the theater's high command, that is to say.

The reason for all of this agitation and eleventh-hour hullabaloo is that the new March of Time deals exclusively with a single subject, a conspicuous deviation from the producers' usual custom of including at least three "clips" in each of its documentary pictorial treatises upon world affairs. That subject is the allegedly "inside story" of Nazi Germany under the regime of Fuehrer Hitler.

It is reported that the matter of Nazi activities, both in Germany and America, formed the basis of this penetrating analysis of what the movement is all about, its present operation, and future potentialities. It was emphasized in the Chicago imbroglio—if that is what it was—that the release of the picture would jeopardize the standing of German functionaries in America, reasonably high in the councils of Herr Hitler's governmental establishment, and probably would end their official careers. The same thing might happen here. So there you are. There will be no March of Time at RKO-Keith's tomorrow.

Who's running this country, anyhow?

This article expresses my sentiment. I have risen today to call the attention of the House to this article and to repeat the question as my own sentiment: Who is running the United States, anyhow?

Only recently we saw in nearly all theaters the motion pictures of the events that have taken place in the far eastern crisis. Some of these were included in the March of Time program. These pictures depicted many things of a condemning nature against Japan. Maybe Japan did not like it very well, but we did not say that we were going to forfeit the prerogatives we have in America for freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom to express criticism against any condition or policy in our own or any other country. Instead, we said that they could go ahead

and run those pictures and "let the chips fall where they might."

A few months ago we saw this country engaged in a dispute over the enlargement of the Supreme Court. We saw that great struggle depicted in motion pictures, as well as in the press, and on the public platform. A great many people rose in those various outlets of public opinion and expressed criticism against our own President, but there was not anybody in this country who questioned the fundamental right of any individual to do that very thing. If we can criticize our own President or undesirable policies in this country, why should we countenance a condition that will not permit the showing of a film like this, which reveals the inside workings of the Nazi government, the Hitler government, which are not proper; in other words, to reveal critical facts on Hitler and the policies he advocates? Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the people of this country ought to have the privilege of seeing anything that can be disclosed against dictatorships so the American people will realize that they should give everything they have in the way of time, services, and resources in order to avoid such a fate themselves. Again, I ask: Who is running this country, anyhow?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am sympathetic with the idea the gentleman advances that there should be a free and untrammelled press in this country. I am sure, however, that the gentleman will draw a distinction between the advisability—I do not like the word "expediency," but maybe it is a good word—of perfectly free editorial comment, picturization, and criticism.

Does not the gentleman make a distinction between the advisability of any such picture as probably is contained in the March of Time and I have no idea of what it is, and I do not think the gentleman has either—

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. I do not either.

Mr. WOODRUM. It is something that reflects very vitally against the present regime in Germany. Does not the gentleman think in the present world crisis there ought to be some caution and some considerable conservatism exercised in permitting pictures, editorial comments, or anything which directly reflects on another government with which at the present time we are on friendly relations?

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Theoretically I agree with the gentleman to a certain extent, but practically I do not. It seems to me one of the crises to which you might refer is the spread of dictatorships, and it is just as important that this crisis be met as any of the others that face us. One of the essentials in meeting this crisis, and at the same time conforming to the principles of free expression, that are so dear to us as a part of our system of government, is that we should let the American people know what happens to a nation under dictatorship, and consequently we certainly should permit the showing of a picture of this kind in our country. I protest against keeping public information like this "under blankets." Let us have the truth about these dictatorships.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think that the situation that exists in Washington with regard to the airport is scandalous. I do not blame the pilots for refusing to land on unsafe airports and to risk not only their own lives but the lives of their crew and passengers. I do not know whose fault it is, but certainly the time has come when we should have a satisfactory airport for the city of Washington. We have had for many years without question the worst military and naval airports and the worst commercial airport in the country. We have to some extent improved the situation with reference to our military airport. The new Bolling Field is a reasonably fair airport, but it is a long way from being adequate for even the purposes for which it was designed. It has adequate runways north and south, but you still have not satis-



factory runways east and west. However, it is so much better than anything else we have here that we ought to use it in the meantime as a base of operations for the commercial airplanes, if they are to continue to land in Washington, and then set about to build an adequate modern airport.

I cannot agree that Gravelly Point is going to be a satisfactory one. In the first place, it is too close to Bolling Field. They are on the river, right across from each other. You are going to get into serious trouble if you mix the landings of commercial planes and military planes. There will very likely be such confusion that there will result collisions in air traffic.

Gravelly Point is limited in size to the extent to which it may be developed; therefore it will never be an adequate airport for transport planes, even today, and certainly not for the commercial planes of tomorrow. We can just as easily go out 5 or 10 miles and build the type of airport which we need. We might develop Gravelly Point for a temporary field but, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Hoover-Washington Airport can easily and quickly be made perfectly satisfactory for fair-weather operations. When the weather is bad and when they have to resort to blind landings, commercial and military planes should not be mixed up in a city like Washington. The air traffic should not be brought in over the city at all. Blind landing approaches should not be made around the Washington Monument. It is a miracle we have not had a tragedy in this city up to the present time, but this cannot go on indefinitely without the deplorable situation being forcibly brought to our attention in a tragic manner. After all, it is the failure of Congress whether the responsibility be up to the District or up to the Federal Government. The ultimate responsibility rests with the Congress itself.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Federal Government ought to build a model airport here in Washington. The people of the District use the airport comparatively little. The Government officials and those coming here to deal with the Federal Departments are the ones who use it.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman remembers that during the last session the Copeland-May bill was passed, but was vetoed by the President. This bill referred to the Washington-Hoover Airport.

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. As I understand it, the President vetoed it on the proposition that it contained no provision by which the agricultural land included in the bill would be used only so long as that land was used for airport purposes. I have examined the bill since then and I find it contains such a provision and I am at a loss to understand, under these circumstances, why the bill was vetoed.

Mr. MAAS. I am too. I think it was a very unfortunate veto.

I do not believe the Washington-Hoover Airport can be looked upon as our ultimate airport, but it certainly has one of the most desirable locations of any airport in the country so far as convenience to the traveling public is concerned, but we should, and will have to have, a super-airport somewhere out in the country. It is ridiculous to build the major airport on the immediate outskirts of a city or within the confines of a large city.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is the gentleman familiar with the bill I recently introduced for the construction of an airport at Gravelly Point, and also for the construction of such an auxiliary airport as the gentleman refers to in his remarks?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; I am. But I cannot see the purpose of building one at Gravelly Point to replace the Hoover-Washington Airport. It seems to me the Hoover-Washington Airport is, or can easily be made, eminently satisfactory for the purposes for which you would use Gravelly Point. It does not have the disadvantage of conflicting traffic as between

Bolling Field and a commercial field. Why should we not continue to use Washington-Hoover Airport as the local airport and then build the auxiliary airport outside the city?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There are many complications in this subject of airports and, of course, we hardly have time to go into a discussion of all of them now. My purpose in interrupting the gentleman is to say I am in accord with the idea that we should have an airport and I want to invite the gentleman's cooperation along these lines, either in connection with my bill as it stands or in connection with my bill with such amendments as may be suggested.

Mr. MAAS. I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Hearings will begin tomorrow morning before the Committee on Public Lands in the House caucus room.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. My purpose in introducing the bill last year, which was vetoed, was to remedy an existing and imminent need and I think it is even worse today than it was a year ago. The need is greater because the traffic is increasing. I think that bill should be reintroduced and passed and in the interim adequate plans should be developed for some other airport.

Mr. MAAS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I am taking no position with respect to the merits or demerits of Gravelly Point or Camp Springs.

Mr. MAAS. The point, as I see it, is that the Washington-Hoover Airport is there and it will have to be used as it will be some time before we could be able to use Gravelly Point and we should take immediate steps to provide maximum protection in the meantime.

Mr. MAY. In the hearings before our committee it appeared from the testimony that we had from experts appearing on behalf of the commercial lines, as well as on behalf of the Army and Navy and from everywhere else, that it would take probably 3 years to build and put into successful operation an airport at the expense of the Government. I was impressed with the fact that this was private capital that was doing this at the present time.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. No matter what they do about other airports, did not the Naval Affairs Committee come to the conclusion that we might just as well quit thinking about the Camp Springs site?

Mr. MAAS. I think that is right. The gentleman and I flew over there and looked the situation over and we came to the conclusion it would be very unwise to build a commercial airport at Camp Springs. The Navy has a million-dollar radio station over there which would be dangerous to the operation of the airport and operations of planes in the vicinity would destroy the value of the radio station.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to reply to the gentleman from Kentucky to the effect that in the meantime we ought to do something to make Washington-Hoover Airport safer. May I say to the gentleman my bill contains a provision for that very thing; that is, to extend and improve the Washington-Hoover Airport.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, the gentleman knows that the Camp Springs site was selected by a Commission created by this Congress for the purpose of examining all sites available and selecting a site. That Commission did determine upon the Camp Springs site and after that it developed that the Navy had a radio station within 4 or 5 miles of it.

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is why the Naval Affairs Committee entered its objection to that bill. I wonder if

the gentleman knows of any site within a radius of 25 miles of the Capitol at Washington which will not conflict with some interest that the Government has?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, there might be a conflict with some department of the Government, but that is not quite as vital or as important a thing as a conflict with national defense, involved as it is in this other situation of the Navy radio station. The gentleman from California [Mr. Scott] and I flew all over the country surrounding Washington, and we saw many, many suitable sites for an airport of adequate size and with adequate approaches.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me a very curious coincidence that the improvement and enlargement of the Hoover Airport is objected to by the Agriculture Department, the construction of an airport at Gravelly Point meets with objection from the War Department, and the Camp Springs site meets with objection from the Navy Department. I would like to know if the gentleman knows of some site to which some department does not object?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, there are hundreds and thousands of acres of land all around Washington in every direction which would be suitable sites without any objection from any department of Government. Of course, I do not think the objection the Department of Agriculture made in the case of the Hoover-Washington Airport has any merit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lord].

Mr. LORD. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time today that I might speak for the farmers and businessmen of my district. I have a communication or resolution from the Grange, which is one of the very fine and representative farm organizations in my district, calling attention to the fact that we have passed or are trying to pass legislation that will be detrimental to their interest.

At the special session of Congress we passed a so-called farm bill which, I believe, was prepared and dictated by Secretary of Agriculture Wallace. This legislation passed, and as we are all aware, is now being considered by the Conference Committee of the House and Senate. The legislation as it passed this House had nothing favorable in it for the dairy farmers or the farmers of the northeastern portion of the United States. It would only be a detriment to our farmers and mean added expense without any benefit.

We had brought before this session, by petition, the so-called wage and hour bill, which, after days of consideration and debate, was recommitted to the Labor Committee. Agriculture and labor both united in opposition to this legislation, and, to my mind, the words "wages and hours" are only window dressing for the bill. The real scheme back of it all is the control of all industry, or another step forward in dictator government.

I have a resolution, sent me by the Grange in my district, calling my attention to both of these bills and asking me to use my best efforts for their defeat.

The Grange is one of the leading spokesmen for agriculture, and they feel that this legislation will be very detrimental to the farmers of our Nation. They also point out in this resolution their opposition to vesting any more power and authority in the President, that they are opposed to regimentation of agriculture and business, and they point out further that the President should not be given the power he is seeking to disorganize the civil service and governmental activities in order that he may bring them directly under his control.

The farmers of my district, and I believe of the Nation, are becoming very much exercised over the way the Government seems to be drifting; and when we look to other countries and see what is happening there, they become disturbed. I believe they have good grounds for feeling apprehensive of what may come in the future.

We see what is happening in other countries, how the farmers are being regimented and controlled, how every industry is controlled; and what the future of this country

may be, if certain of our leaders have their way, is something I think we need worry about.

I hope the President of the United States, who has created this lack of confidence and brought on this Roosevelt depression, will give up his scheme to regiment and control all farming and all industry. I hope he will let the farmers work out their own destiny without any management coming from Washington. I hope industry may have the assurance of the Chief Executive that he will stop meddling with industry and will try to restore the confidence of the people in our Nation and give protection first to the American farmer and the American manufacturer. I hope he will have some consideration, especially, for the manufacturer in this country, although more consideration now seems to be given to foreign countries than our own.

I believe if all this is done and if the President will cooperate with industry, which is saying today that all they lack is cooperation or confidence, I believe we can restore our agriculture and our manufacturing and that our country will prosper again as it never has before. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pace].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I believe in adequate national defense, but it seems to me that there are matters of more urgent importance demanding our attention at this time.

We are told to rush through appropriations to build more battleships, to cost \$70,000,000 each, while the \$130,000,000 which we appropriated last August for the benefit of the cotton farmers of the South is still being held in the Treasury. This money was intended to help our farmers who were compelled to sell their cotton for less than the cost of production. But unless this Congress takes some early action the Department of Agriculture will keep this money on cold storage until next August or later.

There is no justification for withholding this money from the farmers for 12 long months, when they are in urgent need of it. I have a bill pending to require the Department to pay this \$130,000,000 to the cotton farmers immediately. They need it now. It will help them to start a new crop, to buy necessary supplies, to pay cash for fertilizer, and to secure the necessities of life. I would like to get early action on my bill and certainly believe it is of more importance than spending our time on a Navy appropriation bill that will not become effective until the fiscal year 1939.

While we spend days talking of battleships there is waiting for action a bill to provide funds for feed and seed loans to the farmers of this Nation. I must confess that I cannot understand. The farmers will soon be in need of these loans to start a new crop, and yet he must wait while we debate a bill to provide funds for the Navy for next year.

While this House seeks to prepare for war, and while the administration leaders in the Senate seek to force through the so-called antilynching bill, the new farm bill seems to be forgotten. Can that mean that you have forgotten the folks at home? Do you not know that the time has come when the farmer should know, when he must know, what program he will work under this year? How can he arrange with his tenants and sharecroppers? How does he know how to prepare his land? How can he make his financial arrangements? How can the tenant and sharecropper get a farm to work? Already we have waited too long. Everything else should be put aside and all of our time and our effort should be given to this new farm bill, to this appropriation for feed and seed loans and to securing immediate payment of the 3-cent cotton subsidy and the soil-conservation checks.

I hear that the conference committee which is now considering the farm bills is about to agree to limit this year's cotton crop to 10,000,000 bales, with no additional payments or benefits to the farmers. If that is to be the plan, then what is to be done with the millions of acres of land taken out of cotton? The bills passed by the House and Senate both provide that this land cannot be planted in any other cash crops, and if the conference committee should permit this unfair provision to remain in the bill, I am afraid a



cotton crop of 10,000,000 bales will not bring sufficient to provide our farmers with the necessities of life and will leave idle millions of acres of farm land. If you cut the farmer's allotment so low that it will not provide him with a living, then you place before him the temptation or probably the necessity of refusing to cooperate with the program.

The great problem before the cotton farmer today comes from the fact that we now have on hand a surplus of 12,000,000 bales of cotton. We all know that there is no hope for a good price for cotton as long as this surplus is on the market. I know of only four ways in which we can get rid of this surplus: One is to increase consumption of cotton goods; a second is to reduce production; another is to increase our export sales of cotton; and the fourth is for the Government to take over a good portion of this surplus. Increasing consumption, increasing exports, and reducing production is a long process, and our cotton farmers may be in bankruptcy if they must wait on that, particularly in view of the enormous increase in the production of cotton in foreign countries.

The enormous production of 18,700,000 bales of cotton this year is unprecedented and was due to unusual conditions. It has brought on an emergency condition, and the cotton farmers today are facing as great and as serious an emergency as that which confronted banks and industries in 1933. The Government rushed to the aid of those banks and industries, and I believe the cotton farmer is in his rights in asking that the Government accord him the same treatment. We have heard so much about an ever-normal-granary plan; and I think right now is the time for the Department of Agriculture to set up this ever-normal granary and take over about 10,000,000 bales of this surplus cotton, put it in storage, and hold it for future short-crop years, and possibly use some of it in providing clothing and mattresses and the like to those in need and distress.

If this is done the cotton allotment for this year can be fixed at 13,000,000 bales, which is the normal amount required for consumption in the United States and for export. Then when short crops come, as we know they will, the surplus held in the granary or in storage by the Department of Agriculture can be withdrawn as the need requires.

The farmer must buy his necessities in a protected market and directly bears the burden of a heavy and unfair manufacturers' tariff. The farmer is entitled to benefits to offset this tariff burden, and every dollar which the Government receives through this tariff should be distributed as an equalizing fund to those engaged in agriculture. Even that would not equalize the burden, but it might be sufficient, with present soil-conservation payments, to guarantee our cotton farmers the parity price of 16½ cents per pound for their cotton. At least it would guarantee them that price on the cotton produced for domestic consumption.

A few days ago the commissioners of agriculture of the Southern States were here in Washington and made some very fine recommendations to the conference committee which is now considering the farm bill. Their recommendations were as follows:

We are in favor of a compensatory tariff payment to give the cotton producer parity, the same to be supplemented by the present contemplated soil-conservation payments to that extent.

We recommend that the Congress provide funds for the foregoing from receipts from import duties; and if this be impracticable, then for an excise tax on cotton textiles and competing products, excepting wool and mohair.

We recommend that these payments be made for the year 1938 on a base production of 13,000,000 bales, the same to be prorated among the States according to the 1937 production basis.

We recommend that these payments be made in conformity with the provisions of the present soil-conservation program.

We recommend that sufficient import duties and excise taxes be provided on imported vegetable fats and oils to prevent the importation into this country of more than the difference between our domestic production and consumptive needs.

We further recommend that an adequate tariff be placed upon jute and its products sufficient to protect cotton.

These recommendations are very much in accord with the conclusions which I have reached after months of study and investigation of these questions. You will notice that they

recommend a crop of 13,000,000 bales for this year. I do not agree with them that this allotment should be "prorated among the States according to the 1937 production basis."

That would give an unfair advantage to those States which have only recently increased their cotton production, and I think the allotment should be made among the States according to the production of cotton during the last 20 years. Then the allotment to the counties should be on the same basis, and then the allotment to individual farmers within the county should treat every farmer alike by allotting each the same percentage of the land which he has in cultivation.

I hope the conference committee will give serious consideration to the recommendations of these commissioners of agriculture from the South. And certainly the time has come when we should stop the importation into this country of oils and vegetable fats which are in direct competition with the products of our own farmers. And we are also entitled to an adequate tariff on jute and its products, sufficient to keep it out of competition with cotton.

You may talk of battleships, but I warn you now that you are going to have trouble protecting your own political battle lines unless you give more attention and sympathetic consideration to the serious problems confronting the farmers of this Nation at this hour. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Izac].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I am rather hesitant to take the floor on this question because we heard so much yesterday about experts, and I do not pose as an expert. I believe, after talking with some of my colleagues, however, that I might add a little clarity to the situation regarding battleships. At least that is one of the points I should like to clear up. In the first place, a battleship is chiefly a stable platform at sea on which to mount heavy artillery. That heavy artillery—16- and, perhaps, 18-inch guns—is able to fire at a distance of at least 20 miles, and it can sink any other surface craft that comes within that range. That is the value of battleships. Lighter cruisers, destroyers, are wobbling around in the water, and they cannot always hit what they aim at. Furthermore, they do not have a range of over 10 miles with present installations. The battleship at 20 miles will sink any other craft afloat on the surface. That is the reason we have battleships; and as long as other nations build battleships, I am convinced that we must also, and, in fact, I would rather have ours, bigger and better battleships than theirs.

As to the offensive and defensive quality, I cannot for the life of me see why a battleship is considered only an offensive weapon. It is by far the finest defensive weapon that we have. Interposed between an enemy fleet and our shores, it is going to deny to that enemy fleet the opportunity to land any troops on our shores. Of course, it is aggressive, because we must seek out the enemy fleet and sink it before it arrives at our shores. But it is not an offensive weapon if it is either in the middle of the Pacific or the Atlantic for the express purpose, under the policy of this Government, of denying to other nations an invasion of our shores. As long as we adhere to that national policy, I have no fear that we are making a mistake in building battleships.

How about these planes that we have been hearing about? They say that we can build for \$140,000,000 so many thousands of planes. My friends, those planes have to land somewhere, and the ocean is a big wide lot of water. Unless those planes have ships on which to land, they have to go out there and turn around and come back. So we would not be able to use \$140,000,000 for planes, but we would have to use some for airplane carriers; but even so I believe you would not be able to build for that sum of money more than about 1,200 planes, because they cost all the way from \$55,000 to over \$300,000 apiece. That is why I believe we are wrong in thinking of the airplane-building program in terms of thousands of planes; and I do believe that until the enemy, whoever he may be, is willing to sink his battleships, that we

have to have ships of every category from the battleship down.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. Yes.

Mr. MAY. There is another feature of the battleship that the gentleman has not discussed, and that I would like to have the gentleman bring out, and that is that they are equipped in addition to the long-range guns, with anti-aircraft equipment that might enable them to bring down hostile airplanes.

Mr. IZAC. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a splendid speech. He is the recipient of a medal of honor given by the United States Government and is an expert on this subject. Could we not give him a little more time?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. IZAC. Yes.

Mr. FORD of California. The battleships we are contemplating building will also have a deck on which a plane might land or take off, will they not?

Mr. IZAC. Those battleships always probably will provide for that, and equipment will probably consist of two planes on each ship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the question of the gentleman from California [Mr. Ford], is it not true that on every battleship they have ample facilities for planes to take off? They land in the water, and they hoist them up, and in some respects they are almost airplane carriers.

Mr. IZAC. That is right. I thank the gentleman. To make this fleet more effective and able to function on both coasts, yesterday I introduced a bill for the building of a Nicaraguan canal, and I would like to have everyone consider that in the next few months.

I believe it is vital to national defense. One other thing I would like to mention is this: If we are going to build all kinds of ships, we need the kind that can be used as transports, for we have none to speak of. There are Members in this House who were taken overseas during the World War by our transport force—I was just one little member of it—we took over a good many of you people during the war; we landed you in France, but it took us 6 months to get 50,000 of you over there.

One reason I am so strong for the Ludlow amendment is that if you had all the ships in the world that could be used as transports you would have only approximately 547. Only one nation—Great Britain—can lay down on a foreign shore 1,000,000 men in one fell swoop, and to do that she would have to call in all of her ships from all over the world; but she has not even the army to begin with to send such a force to another land across the seas. This shows you how ridiculous it is to claim that the Ludlow amendment has any other objective than to prevent our raising and equipping an army and sending it thousands of miles across the ocean. I insist it is not against adequate national defense. That is why I am for the Ludlow amendment, because it will put in the hands of the people the final decision as to whether or not we shall raise and equip an army and build ships to transport that army across the seas. They are the ones that are going to have to die if we do. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Gray].

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we should not enter into a foreign war or send a single soldier out of the country to fight in a conflict waged abroad, neither to uphold any treaty with any foreign nation nor any course of interna-

tional policy to enforce the cause of peace by our Army or Navy.

#### THE WAR SPIRIT SPREADING

With the war spirit spreading over the world and the nations in fear and apprehension, entering a foreign war to stop the aggressor, regardless of the fortunes of the conflict, would serve more to engender the spirit of revenge and menace the peace of the future than make for the cause of peace and end war.

#### PEACE DOES NOT REQUIRE GOING TO WAR

Safeguarding or upholding the cause of peace does not require us to go to war with any nation or send a single soldier out of the country. The exercise of our moral and economic powers, our moral force to censure and condemn war before the world, and our economic power to withhold our commerce and trade to carry on or continue a war more than equals the force of armies and navies.

#### BUT MUST MAKE COMPLETE DEFENSE

But, while remaining at home in our own land and observing strict and good-faith neutrality, this Nation should make or prepare complete, full, and adequate defense of our shores in aircraft and all military and naval forces and to the limit in every weapon of modern warfare necessary to safeguard us against attack or attempted invasion.

In preparing such defense full, adequate, and complete, we should prepare ourselves as well to repel any attack because of our condemnation of war, or our course in withholding our commerce and trade from use in keeping the fires of war burning.

#### EVERY MAN SUBJECT TO DUTY FOR DEFENSE

While no man or a soldier should be called to leave our shores to fight abroad, every man should be subject to duty and to be mobilized for the defense of our own country and ready to serve to repel any attack upon our land because of our censure and condemnation of war or to levy and take tribute from us.

#### AMERICANS SHOULD LEAVE WAR ZONE

This Nation should again give warning to all American citizens to leave the war zone in China and offer to provide safe transportation to carry them home, or to other neutral ports, or to assume their own risk and responsibility. To remain is to continue the hazards of complications and to inflame the public mind of both nations.

#### THE "PANAY" INCIDENT

Then the Government should guarantee the property rights of all American citizens acquired in China in time of peace or under treaty and pledge that its destruction will be claimed and compensated for in damages against the nation or the nations charged with its security or responsible for its loss.

And there is another care or precaution which must or should be taken at this time, and that is the special precaution against incidents or demonstrations growing out of the conduct of the war and our international relations with the belligerents to influence and excite the public mind.

The *Panay* incident is settled and closed. But the effect of showing the pictures will serve to excite and inflame the public mind, to arouse and intensify the spirit of retaliation, antagonism, and revenge, and which will serve the only purpose of prompting a popular movement for war.

#### OUR ECONOMIC AND MORAL FORCES

Thus entrenched in the security of our own land with our means of defense made adequate and complete, we should exert both our economic power and moral force to discourage and stop murderous warfare and make a continuance of war impossible, or more difficult, as a duty with which we are charged as a great civilized nation for the cause of humanity.

It is unthinkable and inconceivable that we as a great civilized people should fail to exert the moral force of our place, prestige, and position to mold world public opinion censuring and condemning a resort to war.

#### OUR TRADE AND COMMERCE USED IN WAR

And it is equally unthinkable and inconceivable that this great civilized Nation, while observing neutrality at home in



our own land, should remain in passive silence and indifference to the wholesale slaughter of human beings and allow our materials and supplies in commerce to be used to continue the slaughter of human beings and prolong a conflict.

It is a damning charge against this Nation that Japan is buying up the gold of Europe to send to manufacturers in the United States in exchange for arms and ammunition, and for weapons and implements of war with which to continue the slaughter of the Chinese people.

No course which this Nation could pursue would serve more to invite attacks upon us, nor to endanger our neutrality and peace than to stand indifferent to the warring world around us, remaining in passive silence and submission to the use of our trade and commerce to wage a war of slaughter and destruction.

The men who are insisting upon the trade policy of America supplying arms and ammunition to keep the fires of war burning in China are holding trade, profit, and gain more sacred than the lives of our people whom they would send to fight a foreign war rather than suffer a loss of profits from this commerce and trade.

#### MOLD PUBLIC OPINION

Our moral force to mold public opinion and our economic force to withhold our materials, supplies, and equipment from use in the conduct or continuance of war is greater than all the military and naval power, of all the armies, navies, and aircraft we could mobilize in 1,000 years to stop the war by force of arms.

#### WITHHOLDING OUR TRADE AND COMMERCE

Congress and every American citizen should stand behind the administration to persevere in such international course, exerting our moral force to mold world public opinion in condemnation of the system of war and withholding our trade and commerce from being used as a means to carry on war.

#### THE WORLD HAS CHANGED

Before the great World War was fought I was opposed to large armies and navies, relying upon the progress of civilization and the obligation of treaties to bring the nations of the world together in accord and mutual agreement for the settlement of international disputes.

But the world conflict between the nations has revived the spirit of force and war, and the world depression which followed has brought the people of the earth to a state of suffering and distress even greater, more widespread and agonizing than the anguish of the trenches and battlefields.

#### THE RETURN OF DICTATORS

And in their suffering and desperation they are selling their birthright of freedom for a mess of pottage for present relief. The Great War, followed by the world depression, has opened the way for the return of dictators to win power, acclaim, and glory by waging cruel and relentless warfare.

The advent of these two great calamities, the World War and world depression, has thrown civilization back a thousand years, and the way is again left open for usurpers to destroy the institutions of peace and civil life, and we are carried back past the pyramids to live again in a war-ruled world and under the old order of conquest and subjugation.

#### ONLY ONE COURSE

Facing the world as it is today, there is only one course for the peace-loving nations to pursue and that is to prepare themselves for a full, adequate, and complete defense and wait for the people of the world to again assert and recover back their forms of peace and civil life.

#### MILLIONS FOR DEFENSE—NOT A CENT FOR FOREIGN WARS

My position today is millions for defense but not a cent for war abroad. There was never a time in the world when conditions were more threatening to the peace-loving countries or nations, nor when they should be more on their guard against intrigue and encroachment.

With dictators rising and forming alliances and delivering ultimatums to the peace nations to recognize their conquest by war, and demanding loans made to them to develop their

conquered territories under threat of declaring war or reprisal unless their demands are complied with, it is time for the peace-loving nations to ponder well and consider the future.

When dictators are combining their armies and calling upon the small nations and upon the large peace-loving nations to join with them in their conquests and waiting for a favorable answer under threat of hostile relations, it is no time to rely upon civilization or peace treaties for security and defense of our shores.

#### THE CALL FOR CHINESE RELIEF

The President and the Red Cross have made an appeal to the American people for a million-dollar donation or contribution for the relief of the starving, destitute in China, following in the wake or path of the Japanese invasion and left in smoking ruins and destruction and littered by the dead, wounded, and dying.

This million-dollar contribution called for is a far too small and meager sum to provide for the relief of the Chinese people left homeless, destitute, and suffering and writhing in the agonies of wounds and disease and in pestilence, famine, and want following in the wake of the Japanese armies of invasion.

This million-dollar contribution called for will be found barely adequate and sufficient to begin the rescue and relief work and the call will go out again and again as the war is continued and the invasion pushed farther inward toward the interior. The awful waste and destruction of human habitation cannot be restored or compensated for by meager contributions.

#### AMMUNITION MAKERS AND EXPORTERS

The American people who are responsible for the continuance of this cruel war in China are the American people buying Japanese goods and furnishing the money and means to carry on the war and the ammunition makers and exporters who are furnishing the arms and war materials to continue the war in China.

To continue such support by purchasing from Japan or providing the Japanese invading armies with arms, ammunition, and munitions of war for use in murdering the Chinese people makes America and the American people parties *pari delecto* in the wholesale murder committed under the forms of modern warfare.

#### THE AMERICANS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE

The American people who are responsible for the continuance of the war in China should be the people charged and made to pay this million-dollar relief donation fund. And there ought to be some way to levy and apportion this tax upon them, or otherwise impose the burdens on Japanese goods purchased here and upon the ammunition makers and exporters.

If the people of America are prevented under international relations from taking measures, acting officially as a nation, to withdraw such support of Japan in waging war and prolonging and continuing the war in China, then the people of America ought to act unofficially as individual citizens to withdraw such support.

Without our arms, ammunitions, and war supplies furnished and supplied to the Japanese Army, and without the American people buying the goods and products of Japan and furnishing Japan with the means and money, this cruel and destructive war in China, filling China with death, destitution, and destruction, could not have been continued or prolonged until today.

#### THE WAR REFERENDUM

It may be that such a referendum is not a strategic policy to be resorted to at this time, facing the world relations as they are today.

But history refutes the claim being made that the people would not rise to meet an emergency of defending the Nation. On the contrary, history and experience shows that the aroused and inflamed public mind has often swept congress, parliaments, and rulers to yield to the popular demand of war.

If such a referendum was provided, it would serve to arouse in the people an interest and responsibility for their country as no other issue or problem would arouse, and would call back the town meeting, and would summons the people out to determine policies of Government as our system requires.

#### THE PEOPLE MUST FIGHT AND PAY

The people have to fight the war. The people must furnish the soldiers. The fathers and mothers must offer their sons upon the altar of their country for sacrifice. The people have to pay the cost of the war, the cost of limb and life and treasure, and they should have a voice in declaring war and assuming the obligations of entering into a world war conflict.

#### THE PROBLEM OF A POPULATION OF DIFFERENT NATIONALITIES

While such a referendum is democratic, yet by reason of the mingled races and nationalities composing our population, and their natural sympathies with their home and their country, there will always be a lingering doubt of a united nation in case of war or contest with any such foreign homeland nation.

And it may be by reason of these and other causes such referendum would be more appropriate and practical at some other than this critical international time.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the House this morning to conditions at the submarine training school in New London, Conn. I come from the only district in this country which has a submarine training school, and it is a school which serves our entire Navy. During the recess between the first and second sessions of this Congress, I, together with others of my colleagues from Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, paid a visit to the submarine base and inspected it. To put it mildly, I was shocked by the conditions that have to be endured by the cream of our Navy, the men of the submarine service, what they have to put up with in the line of living conditions. The officers and personnel of the submarine base in New London, Conn., are housed in buildings that were built during the War, over 20 years ago, buildings of wooden construction, fire traps in the most insanitary condition. I have here some pictures I was able to get, showing the conditions these men have to live under.

Here is a picture of a portion of their sleeping quarters. You will notice there is no ventilation, not one window in this building. The building itself is from 15 to 18 feet high and houses between 350 and 400 boys.

Here is a picture of their bathing facilities, a wooden structure. I looked into that room, but I am frank to confess that I would be afraid that if I took a bath there I would get hoof-and-mouth disease.

These buildings are of old construction. A great many new buildings have been built at the base, permanent buildings, such as machine shops, new quarters for the officers, new clubrooms for the officers, but nothing for the personnel.

I call the attention of the members of the Naval Affairs Committee to the fact that I have introduced a bill for the construction of new barracks at this submarine base and a new school and I hope it will receive serious attention. If this bill is passed, these men will be housed in the manner in which they should be housed. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that if before new quarters are built a fire should break out in the middle of the night that one of the most unnecessary and disgraceful calamities the country has faced would occur, for I cannot see how it could be possible that at least several of these men would not be burned to death before they could escape.

Similar conditions exist in the school where these men are trained, these men who are so necessary to the success of our Navy. The lives of each man on a submarine depends upon the man beside him.

The submarine school is ill-ventilated and ill-lighted. Equipment necessary to keep these boys in good condition is lacking and equipment worth thousands and thousands of dollars is housed in old wooden buildings. I am appealing to you today to correct these conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. I may say that I inspected these buildings with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD]. I would like to ask him if he thinks a manufacturer in private industry should be allowed to work his men under the conditions that the men work and live in at the submarine base?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I may say to my colleague from Connecticut that I was deputy commissioner of labor for the State of Connecticut for 6 years. Had I ever gone into a factory and seen men working under such conditions there would have been padlocks put on the doors and the company not allowed to operate.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. What the gentleman describes as a distressing situation is really palatial surroundings compared with what the noncommissioned officers and men live under down at the marine base at Quantico.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It should be corrected if it is. I am speaking only of the submarine base, of which I have personal knowledge, and Congress should correct this condition at once.

Mr. HOUSTON. At Quantico, noncommissioned officers and men are required to live in old frame buildings built during the World War, the men and their wives and youngsters, three and four families in one little flat. It is a disgrace to the Nation that such a thing is allowed to continue.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am familiar only with the conditions at New London but I am interested in correcting them wherever they exist in the service. I hope I may count on the gentleman's support of my bill.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Has the gentleman called to the attention of the Navy Department the conditions he now describes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Only to the attention of the men in charge of the base. They have filed a report with the Navy Department. I believe they are in favor of a replacement of these buildings, but the money must be provided, which I hope will be done at this session of Congress.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I do not believe that the gentleman came before the subcommittee about this matter.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; because I was told that before an appropriation could be made, inasmuch as this was new construction, we would have to get authorization for it. Then I will appear before your committee, and I hope you will give this request your very serious consideration and allow enough money to build these badly needed buildings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may for the benefit of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations state that he is not to blame. The gentleman has a bill pending before the Naval Affairs Committee, upon which hearings have not been held.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman talks about establishments built by the Navy Department to house its personnel. Has the gentleman given any consideration to those men who are not housed by the Government but who are forced to pay from their salaries for rent on their own houses? Has the gentleman ever given consideration further to the fact that they get \$21, \$25, or \$30 a month, and they have to pay \$20



out of that for house rent and themselves and their families are expected to get by on the remainder? While we talk about buildings that the Navy itself is building and supplying to its enlisted personnel, let us give a little consideration to the low-paid men who have to subsist with their families on less pay for what they do than relief clients in many States of the Union.

Mr. FITZGERALD. May I say to the gentleman, I visited this submarine base. We are building more submarines. Under the program we are now embarking on, more submarines are going to be built. If we are to go along in that direction, we should provide fair living conditions for everybody in the service. I am fighting for this particular base because it is in my district, and my attention has been called to it. I made an inspection of it, and I want to do everything in my power to represent my district and try to bring about an improvement in the living conditions of the personnel.

Mr. SCOTT. And I am asking the gentleman to extend his interest to other fields of like nature.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will look up my record, I think he will find I am in sympathy with those kind of people who need my assistance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to differ from so distinguished an authority as the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], but I cannot refrain from replying in just a word to the statement he made with reference to the Ludlow resolution.

It reminds me of the story of a gentleman who for the first time was riding on the elevated railway which leads through the stockyards of Chicago. This gentleman was not acquainted with the fact that the odor from the stockyards is justly infamous.

A lady who occupied the seat in front of him and who worked in one of the large offices in the stockyards district had provided herself with a vial of smelling salts to repel the invasion of the coming odor, of which she was fully advised. As the first whiff attacked their nostrils, she opened her vial of smelling salts and held it to her nose. The odor got worse and worse every minute. Finally the farmer could stand it no longer. He reached over and tapped the lady on the shoulder and said, "I beg your pardon. I do not want to interfere with the enjoyment of your pleasure, but if you would just close that thing up till I can get off I would deeply appreciate the kindness." [Laughter.]

It seems to me that these gentlemen who are backing the Ludlow resolution are confusing stockyards with smelling salts. I mean just this, that not once in the whole history of our Government, in the sense of precipitating hostilities, has the Congress ever declared war. Not once has this body ever exercised its constitutional power to declare war in the sense of beginning hostilities. Three times out of the seven that we have been at war no declaration of war has ever been made and in the other four cases—notably in the War of 1812, when hostilities commenced with the naval engagement between the *Chesapeake* and *Leopold* 5 years before Congress declared that a state of war existed—hostilities have always preceded even the declaration recognizing the existing status.

So it seems to me that the Ludlow partisans have "the wrong sow by the ear," when they criticize Congress and seek to limit the power which, in effect, it has never exercised. [Applause.] But this has nothing to do with the pending bill, however. I am going to offer an amendment to the pending bill to reduce the number of congressional appointments to Annapolis from four to three, not, primarily, because that will save money, although, according to the estimates of the gentlemen who testified before the committee as to that matter, it will save, roughly, \$100,000 the first year, \$200,000 the second, \$300,000 the third, \$450,000 the fourth, and after 4 years, a half million dollars annually.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that any promotion system is wrong which takes in, roughly, 500 new officers a year and kicks out of the service about 250 perfectly fit and worthy officers, no matter how efficient they are. [Applause.]

This is utterly indefensible. It is killing the morale of the officer personnel of the Navy. It casts the shadow of a big question mark upon every officer who is kicked out, no matter how good he may be. It causes all who stay in, to live under a cloud of fear. The system is wrong, cruel. But, aside from these considerations, if we mean business with reference to economy and balancing the Budget, which I fear many of us do not, this ought to appeal to us for it means before many years a saving of a half million dollars a year. [Applause.] Solemnly, I call your attention to the fact that we are ruining, every year, the lives of some 250 efficient officers by forcing the members of the selection boards—who are not to blame for this—to kick them out. And in every one of them we have an investment of from \$24,000 to \$35,000. The blame is ours, for this cruel and uneconomical system. I beg of you that you adopt the amendment which I shall offer, and thereby begin to cure the evil which taints the system. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this naval bill coming as it does now presents a great problem to the United States. We are at the crossroads of a great armament race or we are at the meeting point, you may say, where we will branch out as a moral force in the world to try to work out peace.

If we build these battleships costing \$141,000,000, Japan will be forced to buy more iron scrap from the United States to equal the two ships. Anyone who has been in the harbors of our country has seen the lighters loaded with iron scrap during the last 2 or 3 years destined to Japan to be built into battleships by Japan or to be converted into munitions to help Japan go in and rape China.

Yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] spoke about the amendment that was last year offered by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations [Mr. UMSTEAD] asking the President to call a naval conference of the leading powers of the world to propose some method by which there may be a retention of the present status quo. Of course, the amendment was defeated, but that does not signify that the idea is not good.

Today we are entering into the role of a pacemaker in the building of armaments when we should be setting an example as a peacemaker. If we were to set out and build armaments we, who control a good share of the iron output of the world, have the engineering ability, the factories, and the means of completing this program, could build more ships than Britain, Japan, Russia, or all the other nations combined.

That is easy to understand. Our automobiles are seen all over the world. Neither France nor England can compete with the production ability of General Motors or of Ford. You see the automobiles of those two concerns all over the earth. If we went on a production basis in battleships as in automobiles, we could turn out battleships faster than anybody in the world. However, as the greatest democracy in the world today, as the stronghold of a peace-loving people, should we take that position or should we take the position that at least if we do not enter on a program of sanctions we go on a program of moral suasion? There are thousands who will disagree and say you cannot go on a program of moral suasion with the military group of Japan; that you cannot follow moral suasion with Hitler, Mussolini, or even Joseph Stalin; or any other power entered in the mad armament race; but that the only way you can talk to those fellows is with an index finger coming out of a mailed fist. If that is the case, then we are faced with a situation that we must do all over again what we did in the World War. The question is, Can the world stand another World War greater and more vicious than the one of 1917? We know what

scars were left on the American people by the Civil War, and we know that the scars of the World War will not be healed either economically or socially in this country for 100 years to come. Can we stand another and greater World War at this time? Logically, by building a greater Navy, a Navy of aggression, which, of course, must include the building of battleships, we are entering into a race whose goal must be war, because, if we build battleships, then the other nations must build battleships, and if they build battleships it creates a vicious circle which can have only one ending.

I should like to see this House at least adopt by amendment an idea for a conference. It might be the last conference, but at least it would be a conference on the question, Can we not act as reasonable human beings? Must we always act as animals of the jungle? Is there only one last resort for us? Must that be the resort of fight or death and, perhaps, a threat to the civilization of the world? I know we are isolated over here in America, that we have our Monroe Doctrine, and that relying on the Monroe Doctrine the nations of South America have not armed as extensively as they might have, had not our policy been established 100 years ago. But we do know this, that when civilization is threatened, if the military caste should win in the holocaust, we would be on a perpetual military basis. I am afraid if we do get into a war, the only upshot and the only end we will achieve will not only be fascism as in Europe, but there will be a type of American fascism. We know one of the heritages of the World War was the passage of many antisedition acts, for the repeal of which the liberals of this country have been fighting in the legislatures and in the courts of the country for the last 20 years. I wonder, if war comes, if when the war ends we will have a democracy in this country, or will we have a limited government, in which your right and my right to worship as we desire, to speak as we desire, and to write as we desire will not be seriously curtailed.

These are some of the implications behind the naval bill this session, having in mind, of course, the administration is expected to send us an additional request for more ships, and, of course, asking for more ships and a greater navy means you must have an auxiliary fleet for the protection of the big battleships which are called for in this bill—two in number. These are the questions in my mind as I vote on this bill. I think they ought to be the questions in the minds of all thinking Americans. Is the United States, today the greatest democracy in the world, going to say to the world, "We are no longer interested in acting as reasonable human beings; we are getting ready for war"? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly that item in the pending bill which contains a provision for enlarging the operation of the Alexandria torpedo station. I had not expected to discuss this subject at all and would not have done so except that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] in whose district is situated the torpedo plant at Newport, saw fit to object, in general debate a few days ago, to the reopening and enlargement of the plant at Alexandria.

In reply to his remarks I want to lay before the House the facts as set forth by the Navy Department. I do not claim to know how torpedoes ought to be manufactured or how many we ought to manufacture, and when it comes to a determination of the question of when, how, and in what manner our Navy is to have its necessary ammunition manufactured, I believe this House, like myself, will say that is a question to be determined by the experts of the Navy Department and not by the wishes or desires of any of us Members who may happen to have available factories in our districts, and I say what I am saying in all kindness to my good friend from Rhode Island. I do not blame him for wanting to have all the Government activities in his district that he

can get, but I think this House ought to be informed as to what the situation is, and I know you have not all had time to read this voluminous set of hearings.

I want you to know what is the status of torpedo manufacturing for the Navy now. The Navy Department tells you in these hearings that by 1941 we will have 34 new submarines and 89 new destroyers, that if the Newport plant continues to operate as it is operating now on a 24-hour basis, working 3,300 and some men, and the Alexandria plant continues to operate at the rate proposed in this bill, although we will have all of these new vessels by 1941, it will be 1944 before the Navy can properly ammunition these ships.

Now I say to you, as the Navy Department said to your Subcommittee on Appropriations, that the matter of a shortage in the manufacture of torpedoes is serious, and it is a question that must necessarily be left to the Navy Department to determine. I suspect you naval experts in the House know that on these submarines and destroyers the primary armament is the torpedo. They must have them. If you do not give them enough torpedoes there is not any sense in building the submarines and destroyers. It is just like giving you a shotgun and saying you cannot have any shells for 10 years because we cannot manufacture them fast enough.

All of the torpedoes now being manufactured are being manufactured at one plant at Newport, and as I told you, and as the Navy Department has told you, although they are working 24 hours a day with 3,300 and some men, they are falling behind in the manufacture of torpedoes every day, and with Alexandria operating with the force proposed it will be 1944 before they can possibly catch up.

My good friend referred to the Alexandria torpedo plant as the reopening of an old plant. The fact is, the Alexandria torpedo station was built during the World War at an expense of \$3,000,000. It was a new, complete, adequate, and modern plant. The Newport plant has been operating since 4 years after the Civil War. We would think that was probably a right old plant, but the Alexandria plant is a brand new factory erected by this Government at a cost of \$3,000,000, and the Navy needs it today and is asking for an appropriation to reopen it to meet this urgent need for ammunition, and there should not be any objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will let me proceed a minute and finish what I have to say, I will be pleased to yield.

Notwithstanding this request of the Navy Department, if it is granted as the Navy Department wants you to grant it and as the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations wants you to grant it, it will be 1940 before the Alexandria plant could even begin delivery of torpedoes. If you do not open the Alexandria plant here is what happens: There is no authorization of law for any appropriation to open any other plant. There is no authorization of law to enlarge the Newport plant, and therefore you would have to get legislation, and the Navy Department tells you that you would delay the production of necessary torpedoes to ammunition the ships you are now building for a further period of at least 1½ years. So if you open the Alexandria plant you are necessarily going to be 2 or 3 years behind in ammunitioning these ships you are now building. If you do not open the Alexandria plant and undertake to get legislation to open a new plant, it is going to take you about 5 years after these ships are completed before you can get any ammunition on them to make them useful.

I now yield to my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is it not true that although the Government spent \$50,000,000 on the Alexandria plant, previously, they never produced a single perfect torpedo, and is it not also true—

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me answer one question at a time.



At Alexandria they spent \$3,000,000, not \$50,000,000, and they produced as many torpedoes as they needed, so far as I know. They first started out as an assembly plant—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did they ever manufacture a torpedo that was able to be discharged?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; they started to make an assembly plant at Alexandria and they found that would not work. They, therefore, began the manufacture of torpedoes at Alexandria and the Armistice came along and they did not need any new torpedoes, so they closed up the brand-new plant and went back to Newport.

As to any question about the ability to manufacture at Alexandria or the facilities to manufacture at Alexandria, the Navy Department tells you in these hearings it is the best and the only available place where they can manufacture torpedoes.

I now yield further.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think that Secretary Swanson, who has made the report, is a disinterested party?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am going to ask for an opportunity to answer that question. I do not think that is a fair question. There is nothing in these hearings that shows that Secretary Swanson has ever opened his mouth on the subject. Secretary Swanson served with distinction for years in this body and served in the Senate as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. No man can say that he ever undertook to favor Virginia or any section over any other section in locating necessary naval facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Further, as long as the question of the Secretary has been brought up—and I am one of his warm personal friends—I am glad to say, having known him for 25 years, I wish to take this opportunity to state that I have never spoken to him on the subject of opening the Alexandria torpedo station and he has not said a word to me about it, because the question is one that ought to be decided by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance. And if he has ever personally taken any action in respect to it, I am unaware of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that while he was a member of another body, to which we cannot refer, he introduced a bill to do this.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know whether he did; if he did, he was doing right and should be commended.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The records will show that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But certainly it does not appear that he had anything to do personally with the recommendation of the Bureau of Ordnance to reopen the Alexandria plant at this time in order to meet the urgent need for torpedoes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE].

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I have no knowledge of what is necessary to constitute an adequate national defense, and I have not any knowledge whatever as to what authority or board or commission or anybody else recommended the passage of the bill that is now under consideration. What I want is information. I want to further preface what I am about to say with the statement that I supported the Ludlow resolution. I never have heretofore voted for either an Army or a Navy appropriation bill, but the conditions in the world now are such that I feel somewhat impelled to change my views, and I want some information before I do. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if he can tell me first by whom and by what authority was this bill written, which stated that a national defense equipment requires the building of these ships that are scheduled in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The authority for all this appropriation with reference to the building program results from the Washington and London Treaties and the law which was enacted by the Congress in 1934.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Let me interrupt the gentleman to say that I care nothing about the Treaty of London or the Treaty of Washington. What I want is a categorical answer to my question.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Congress of the United States authorized everything the bill provides for. We wrote the policy after debating the question on the floor of the House in 1934.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Does the gentleman say or is he prepared to say what board or what commission or what naval authority recommends to us the building of two \$70,000,000 battleships, and these other ships contained in the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. The law of 1934 provides and the treaty provides that when ships become overage, it is the duty of the Congress to authorize their replacement. The President of the United States in approving the Budget has recommended to Congress the laying down of two ships called for in this bill, to take the place of overage, 26-year-old ships.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Very well. Did any naval board of strategy or board of any other kind recommend these ships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The law of 1934 passed on the recommendation of the naval experts and this Democratic administration.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I ask the gentleman specifically if in 1937 or in 1938 any naval board or authority connected with the United States Navy recommended the building of these ships.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As I stated a moment ago, Congress writes the policy. The Navy Department suggests it, and after suggesting the policy, Congress debated it, and determined the policy prescribed in the act of 1934 under which this building program is authorized, and that is the result of inquiry by both Congress and naval authorities and everybody who debated the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired for general debate. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NAVAL RESERVE

For expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve and Naval Militia, including the designing, purchasing, and engraving of trophies; pay and allowances of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when employed on authorized training duty; mileage for officers while traveling under orders to and from training duty; transportation of enlisted men to and from training duty, with or without pay, and subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; subsistence of enlisted men during the actual period of training duty, with or without pay; subsistence of officers of the Fleet Naval Reserve while performing authorized training or other duty without pay; pay, mileage, and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve and pay, allowances, subsistence, and transportation with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof, of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve when ordered to active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve; pay and allowances, including travel and other allowances as authorized by law (excluding clothing and small-stores issues and uniform gratuities), of aviation cadets of the Naval Reserve when ordered to active duty, including active duty undergoing training; pay of officers and enlisted men of the Fleet Naval Reserve for the performance of not to exceed 48 drills per annum or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties, and administrative duties, exclusive, however, of pay, allowances, or other expenses on account of members of any class of the Naval Reserve incident to their being given flight training, unless, as a condition precedent, they shall have been found by such agency as the Secretary of the Navy may designate physically and psychologically qualified to serve as pilots of naval aircraft, \$8,790,320, and, in addition, \$371,000 of the appropriation "Organizing the Naval Reserve, 1938," such amount of such appropriation being hereby reappropriated, and of the total of such amounts not more than \$150,000 shall be available for maintenance and rental of armories, including pay of necessary janitors and for wharfage; not more than \$81,000 shall

be available for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department; not less than \$3,063,032 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for aviation material, equipment, fuel, and rental of hangars, and not more than \$397,914 shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for fuel and the transportation thereof, and for all other expenses in connection with the maintenance, operation, repair, and upkeep of vessels assigned for training the Naval Reserve, and of such total sum \$6,455,265 shall be available exclusively for and on account of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve aviation: *Provided*, That, except in time of war or during the existence of a national emergency declared by the President, no appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay more than 20 officers of the Naval Reserve and 1 officer of the Marine Corps Reserve above the grade of lieutenant or captain, respectively, the pay and allowances of their grade for the performance of active duty other than the performance of drills or other equivalent instruction or duty, or appropriate duties and the performance of 15 days' active training duty, and other officers above such grades employed on such class of active duty (not to exceed 4 months in any calendar year) shall not be entitled to be paid a greater rate of pay and allowances than authorized by law for a lieutenant of the Navy or a captain of the Marine Corps entitled to not exceeding 10 years' longevity pay: *Provided further*, That no appropriation made in this act shall be available for pay, allowances, or traveling or other expenses of any officer or enlisted man of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve who may be drawing a pension, disability allowance, disability compensation, or retired pay from the Government of the United States; and "retired pay" as here used shall not include the pay of transferred members of such reserve forces.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question.

It is my recollection that the number of personnel ashore provided for in this bill shows a very considerable increase over the number provided for covering the previous year. It is my recollection that it runs somewhere around 25,000 out of probably 100,000 total. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Over what number of years?

Mr. TABER. Over the last couple of years. It is my recollection that the figures show a marked increase in the number of enlisted personnel ashore as compared with previous years.

Mr. UMSTEAD. If the gentleman will refer to page 110 of the hearings he will notice that the enlisted men ashore on September 30, 1937, numbered 23,910; in 1938, 25,177; and the estimate for 1939 is 25,744.

Mr. TABER. It is my recollection also that the number has gone up 7,000 or 8,000 as compared with the number 3 or 4 years ago. It seems to me that the enlisted personnel ashore has been going up at a more rapid rate than the increase in the personnel afloat would seem to justify. I am wondering what the gentleman's thought about that is?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I do not have the figures instantly before me for years prior to 1937 for the enlisted men ashore. The gentleman will find, however, on page 109 of the hearings, the number of enlisted men afloat for the same years for which I gave him the number ashore. I may also say that it is my information that the number of enlisted men ashore has for a number of years been in excess of 20,000.

Mr. TABER. I notice the item for cost of provisions, rations, has been carrying a rather marked increase. I am wondering if the committee takes into consideration in connection with figuring those things out the reduction that has been taking place in wholesale prices the last 2 or 3 months and the fact that probably all through the next fiscal year we shall have lower prices than we had, say, the 1st of July, when some of the contracts for such things were made?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I may say in reply to the gentleman from New York that the ration for the current fiscal year is figured upon the basis of 47 cents. When the subcommittee passed upon this matter for the fiscal year 1939, we found that the latest available cost figures justified a ration cost of 49 cents. I may say to the gentleman, of course, we know that the price trend now is downward. At the same time, however, the committee could not very well guess at what the ration cost would be. The best we could do was to use the last figure which the Navy Department had

covering the last quarter for which they could give us an actual figure. If the ration should cost less, there will, of course, be a saving.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that I do not know where in this bill there is any provision for sending our marines to China; and perhaps I could be advised by the Chairman so that I would be strictly in order when I speak on that proposition. Is there any place in the bill where provision is made for a sum of money for sending 2,500 marines to Shanghai?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I will answer the gentleman's question this way: All of the money which the United States Marine Corps will be able to spend during the fiscal year 1939 is carried in this bill, for whatever purpose it may be expended. The item of transportation, I suppose, is the one to which the gentleman's question most probably would be directed.

Mr. FISH. That is correct.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The use of the transportation fund, of course, is an administrative matter, subject to law and regulation, and, beyond the amount of the appropriation, would not be controlled by this bill.

Mr. FISH. Is a lump sum provided for the Marine Corps, with which they may do as they wish?

Mr. UMSTEAD. No; I should not say that. We provide specifically for the various activities of the Marine Corps, but it is true interchange authority exists. The estimate submitted for transportation, Marine Corps, the gentleman will find as a separate item in the appropriation bill, in the hearings, and in the committee report.

Mr. FISH. Is there anything in this appropriation bill to provide for the transportation of 2,500 marines to Shanghai?

Mr. UMSTEAD. The answer to that is "no"; there is nothing in the bill that would provide any particular place or any particular expedition involving the transportation of marines. There is an item in this bill that covers the transportation cost of the Marine Corps, estimated for the year 1939.

Mr. FISH. There is, evidently, no particular section that covers that particular item.

While I am not opposed to sending 2,500 marines to Shanghai, I am opposed to keeping them there indefinitely. Why should we keep 2,500—that is a large number of United States marines in Shanghai indefinitely?

What I am trying to find out is: What is our policy? How long are those marines to remain in China?

When it comes to the Army bill I shall want to know where we appropriate to keep 800 men of the Fifteenth Infantry in Tientsin. I am absolutely opposed to keeping any infantry, any soldiers of the Regular Army in a foreign country. There is some excuse for sending marines on some specific or emergency duty but there is no common sense in keeping them in foreign countries indefinitely year after year except at our legation in Peking and a small force at Shanghai. I would like to have some opportunity to discuss the proposition of bringing back our soldiers from Tientsin. The Fifteenth Infantry has been there for 30 years, since the Boxer Rebellion for no purpose whatever that I can find. I believe the Army staff wants them back. I do not believe it is in accord with their strategy to have an infantry regiment of our Army stationed indefinitely in a foreign country.

When it comes to providing for the maintenance of our marines in Shanghai there is evidently nothing specific in this bill. Why can we not bring back at least half of those marines? I see no reason to have a large number of marines in a city like Shanghai at the present time. They are a menace to our peaceful relations as some unavoidable brawl may involve us in serious difficulties. We, perhaps, have not got 2,500 American citizens in Shanghai, yet we maintain a marine force of that many there. I am sorry that there is not some item we could strike out in order to bring about a full and free consideration of this question.

[Here the gavel fell.]



Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I quote from the Chicago Tribune Press Service the following:

LONDON, January 6.—Under the heading "Can We Rope in America?" G. K.'s Weekly—a magazine founded by the late Gilbert K. Chesterton, noted British writer—declared in an article today that the British have half won the struggle to get the United States into a war against Japan in the Far East.

Getting the United States lined up to fight for British interests in the Orient is the most immediate practical question in English politics today, the article said.

The article asserted that the Japanese want the revenue England has enjoyed from the Orient and are in a fair way to get it. The only way for England to stop the Japanese is to fight them, it continued, adding that England is not strong enough to wage the war single-handed.

The article then said:

"The French, though they have similar interests in the Far East, are not to be relied upon. The hopes we had of Russian interference have failed. There remains the United States.

"It is commonly said up and down Europe that we can make the United States do what we like.

"We got the United States into the Great War on our side, and, what was more extraordinary, we managed in the debt business to make France the villain of the piece. We have got them (the United States) to feel with us against modern Italy, and we have got them to talk of ourselves as a 'democracy'—which is prodigious."

After this admission the article continued: "Can we rope them in to fight or threaten the Japanese?" It is a question of most poignant interest, and it is a question that will be answered in a comparatively short time in one way or another.

"The advantages we have in working American opinion and policy are very great, and they have been used in the past with so much success that those who think we shall win the trick have much to say for themselves.

"We are the only people of the Old World who still use the same printed word and largely the same spoken word as the Americans.

"Vastly different as we are from the Americans, we have in common with them moral ideas proceeding from the men who dominated the English in the seventeenth century. We know what will move American indignation and enthusiasm even when it does not move our own.

"American opinion is inflammable and just as we got up the cry 'To hell with the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs,' so we might get up a slogan for the Pacific.

"We are about halfway to our goal. Shall we be able to reach it? As things now stand, our chances are—to put it in American—about 50-50."

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

##### ORDNANCE AND ORDNANCE STORES, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material for the armament of ships; for the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances; for the purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and proving grounds; for technical books; plant appliances as now defined by the "Navy Classification of Accounts"; for machinery and machine tools; for accident prevention; for experimental work in connection with the development of ordnance material for the Navy; for maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and naval ordnance plants, and for target practice; not to exceed \$15,000 for minor improvements to buildings, grounds, and appurtenances of a character which can be performed by regular station labor; for payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled freight and passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations; for the pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots, and for care and operation of schools at ordnance stations at Indianhead, Md.; Dahlgren, Va.; and South Charleston, W. Va., \$26,849,600: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules

in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,380,000.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORAND: Page 23, line 15, after the first comma, strike out "\$26,849,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,572,600."

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered strikes from the item appropriated for the Bureau of Ordnance the sum of \$1,277,000, the amount requested for the opening of the torpedo station at Alexandria, Va.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I am convinced now more than ever that this is the entering wedge to siphoning away from the torpedo station at Newport the activities we have there.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman has just made a very broad, comprehensive statement when he says he is convinced that the appropriation of a small amount of money to open a plant that is already built at Alexandria, Va., is the entering wedge to doing away with the torpedo station in Rhode Island. The gentleman heard the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations when he stated before the full Committee on Appropriations and on the floor of this House that this had absolutely no significance toward the torpedo station in Rhode Island; that the Navy Department did not mean to do anything of the sort, and the committee specifically took affirmative action to disabuse any such intention by appropriating further funds for reconditioning the torpedo plant in Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I cannot yield further. I will answer the gentleman. That promise has been made and I believe the committee is sincere, but the hearings show differently when Admiral Furlong was pinned down by a question asked by Mr. DITTER. I quote the following:

Mr. DITTER. Admiral, is your request for the reopening of this plant predicated entirely on the matter of expedition?

Admiral Furlong replied:

No; not entirely. But, of course, that is a great thing now; it is principally on expedition and cost but also on the fact that it is unwise to have all of the manufacturing of our torpedoes at one place.

In another part of the hearings we are told by Admiral Furlong that as soon as we return to normal, Alexandria will proceed to manufacture torpedoes with 600 men, which is an increase over the present status of 600 percent. He also tells us in the very same statement that Newport will be cut to 1,000 men on 1 shift a day, a net loss of 70 percent for Newport.

Mr. Chairman, I am sincere when I say this is an entrance wedge because, as I said the other day, if the Navy Department had not intended to eventually take away those activities from Newport, it would have started in 1934 to replace the machinery there and try to keep the plant in up-to-date condition.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] stated a few minutes ago that I referred to Alexandria as an old station when I spoke the other day. I did, and when I made that reference to old station I had reference to a station that had been inoperative since 1923. I believe in the item set forth now the sum of \$200,000 is included to put the building in condition. I hope I am wrong in that assumption, and I stand ready to be corrected.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will be fair and realize that the station at Newport at the present time employs 3,375 men. It is the lifeblood of Newport County. It is the only activity we have there to take care of our people. If eventually we are going to close down the torpedo station there, let us admit it now.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. Chairman, I undertook day before yesterday, when I presented this bill, to discuss as clearly as I could the matter of the torpedo station at Alexandria.

Let us get this issue down to exactly what is involved. First of all, this is not a sectional matter.

The first question before us is, Does the Navy need torpedoes? The officials of the Department say it does, and they say the present situation is such as to demand additional torpedo facilities. If this be admitted, and there is no one who denies the statement, then the second question is, How quickly do they need them? No one can answer that question, but your committee is told that in order to equip the ships and planes now coming into the fleet they are in need of them at once—just as soon as they can be manufactured. Where and how can they be gotten in the shortest time and for the cheapest cost? We are told by the Department, Alexandria. Why? Because a building is there which was built for the purpose of manufacturing torpedoes, and it is the only unused existing torpedo plant in the United States.

I have here a letter dated December 29 from Admiral Furlong, in which he states they have examined all possible locations in the United States as far as existing facilities are concerned, and that there is nowhere else under the control of the Navy a building already constructed in which torpedoes can be made. The testimony is that the building and the equipment now at Alexandria have a replacement value in excess of \$2,000,000, and that that plant can be set up and put into operation and turn out torpedoes sooner than at any other location.

Are you interested in this question from the standpoint of national defense or are you interested in it from the standpoint of building a torpedo station in some congressional district in the United States?

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman advise the Committee whether or not the use of the Alexandria site will curtail the production of torpedoes at Newport within the next few years?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I thank the gentleman for asking the question. The testimony before our subcommittee was that Newport, running 24 hours a day with all of its facilities, would be totally unable to supply the demands of the Navy Department, and that the combined production of Alexandria and Newport, running Newport at full strength, just as it is now running, and Alexandria at maximum production on an 8-hour day, would not be sufficient to furnish the required number of torpedoes to equip the present vessels and aircraft of the Navy until after 1944. After that time, on the basis of the ships and airplanes that have come and will come into service under the present program, there would be a curtailment in the production of torpedoes, unless the building program about which you have heard so much, but which has no connection with this bill, is brought in and enacted, resulting in bringing into the fleet and the Air Corps additional ships.

I shall answer the gentleman further by saying that as far as I know, no member of the subcommittee wishes it to appear that the Navy Department was going to be permitted to dismantle the Newport station. On the contrary, there is not one word of evidence in this record to justify that assumption. The subcommittee, in order to make clear to the interested parties in Newport, to New England, to the Navy Department, to the Congress, and to everybody, that we did not wish anything to happen to the Newport station, because it is efficient and can put out torpedoes of first-class quality, placed in this bill, in addition to an item of \$100,000 in the Budget for small tools, a provision enabling the Navy Department to use an additional \$200,000 for the replacement of machinery and machine tools at that station.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Can the gentleman tell us whether any curtailment of employment is contemplated in the next few years at the Newport torpedo plant?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I shall answer the gentleman directly by saying that if the evidence before us may be relied upon, if the Alexandria station is reopened, and if 1,000 men are put to work there, as it is contemplated they will be, no reduction in the number of torpedoes produced at Newport could take place before 1944.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I am interested in the gentleman's statement and would like to have this additional information. Why have two of these stations on the Atlantic coast and none on the Pacific coast?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I answer the gentleman as I did in the beginning. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, if this torpedo station is not opened at Alexandria, an additional establishment will be built on the west coast. In my judgment, if the Navy Department has to call upon Congress to put up \$2,000,000 to duplicate something it already has, the station will go to the west coast and not to the east coast. However, the answer to the gentleman's question is that the Government has at Alexandria a torpedo station already built; it needs torpedoes, and it needs them now. If the Government has to go to some other place to erect a building, it would delay the procurement of torpedoes from 18 months to 2 years beyond the delay which would come from reopening the Alexandria plant.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. Naturally, coming from the west coast, I am interested in the remarks the gentleman has just made, not only from the standpoint of speed in getting the torpedoes but likewise the cost of building the new plant as against the cost of reconditioning the Alexandria plant.

Mr. UMSTEAD. You start off with an additional cost of \$2,000,000, but on top of that are to be added such things as a power plant, now available at Alexandria, and certain supervisory work, which would be available at Alexandria without duplication, but would not be if the station were built at some other place in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there is no statute authorizing the building of a torpedo station anywhere else. If this Congress today votes down the proposal to build a torpedo station at Alexandria, it would mean that there would be no authority by which we could appropriate money until legislation has been passed. I urge the Committee to stand by what your Committee on Appropriations has done in this matter. We have tried to be fair about it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. We have undertaken to recommend to you what I propose to keep trying to recommend to you, the cheapest and the best way to do what we are called upon to provide for.

Now, what will you do when you vote contrary to our recommendation? You say to the Navy Department, "You have got to waste \$2,000,000 to duplicate an already existing torpedo station." What else? "No matter how bad you need torpedoes, we will not help you get them until you decide to build a torpedo station where some two or three or half a dozen Members of the Congress think it ought to be built."

I submit on this question the Navy Department ought to be followed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.



Mr. Chairman, the Navy Department is now the owner of two white elephants that I know of. We have at Charleston, W. Va., an investment of about \$25,000,000 in an armor-plate plant that is not now in use. It is used, in part, for storage purposes. This is an investment that is making no return to the country whatever. We have at Sunnyvale, Calif., a \$5,000,000 airdrome that we established several years ago to house lighter-than-air craft. It is no longer being used for that purpose, but has been turned over to the Army. I doubt whether the Army can make any efficient use of it.

We are now faced with the proposal of turning our faces against the fact that we have a building down here in Alexandria located on two and a half acres of land that cost us \$128,000 back in 1919, on which there is a great cement building, so large that it spans two blocks and has a connecting passageway over the street that intervenes between the two buildings, all set up and ready to receive the necessary machinery for the manufacture of torpedoes; and go elsewhere and put up new buildings for the same purpose. This does not seem good business to me.

I am sympathetic with the purposes of the gentleman from Rhode Island in protecting the torpedo plant in that State. That is his business and he ought to be diligent.

The gentleman quotes Admiral Furlong as predicting what we are going to do in the future in the manufacture of torpedoes. Admiral Furlong has a tour of duty in the Navy Department and will probably be there 3 years. When the question of our future policy arises, in all probability, he will be gone, and that future policy will be determined by this committee and this House. When there is an effort to discriminate against Newport, this House can act, and act pretty quickly. It is fair to assume that naval strategy would require a torpedo plant on the Atlantic coast, and therefore I do not think the fears expressed about crippling or handicapping Newport are valid.

In conclusion, are we going to abandon this tremendous investment in Alexandria, ready to produce torpedoes, and go elsewhere and duplicate this building at a cost of several million dollars? You can go down to the river's edge at Alexandria and see this torpedo plant, and I believe you will agree that it would be a piece of folly for us to duplicate this building elsewhere. If we attempt to increase production at Newport, it is admitted there are not sufficient buildings there to increase the output, and it would mean the construction of new buildings.

I submit it is pretty sound policy to have two sources of supply. You may not operate both plants at the same time, but you can have one of them in reserve in the event of an emergency.

Therefore, I hope the Committee will stand by the subcommittee in what I believe is an entirely wise decision.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

The members of the Appropriations Committee might be persuasive, if it were not for the fact there is a history back of this proposal. This is not the first time this subject has come up. Alexandria once before had a factory which cost the Government a number of millions of dollars. The history is they never turned out a finished torpedo that could be put to use; it all being part of the wartime extravagance.

The gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee make much of the argument they have a large building which has been idle for a great many years. I submit this ought not to be the determining factor in deciding where to secure the additional facilities if more are needed. The facilities should be located where they will be most economically and most efficiently conducted, and I do not believe that is in Alexandria. Newport could easily be expanded. The cost would be less, there would be less needed for administrative personnel, and the torpedoes could be secured more easily.

First we might well ask, Why the haste? The gentleman talks about this unprecedented demand for torpedoes that is

going to continue for at least 6 years. How does the gentleman know it is going to continue for all those years? Why do we need them immediately? Are we facing a war? If so, let the gentleman come out and say so. The House is entitled to any information of that sort. I do not believe we should be hurried into a hasty spending of several millions of dollars to reopen a factory once closed.

What do we find about Alexandria? Alexandria has not been able yet to satisfy some House committee members it has the water supply necessary to conduct a project of this sort. The vote to establish the Alexandria plant was only by a 4 to 3 vote of the committee which studied the question. At Alexandria they are obliged to carry torpedoes 60 miles for tests. Do you think this is good business with Newport on the edge of a great sheet of water? A private enterprise would abandon any factory any time if the manager thought he could operate more efficiently and economically somewhere else. The building value would be of minor importance. Look at Newport, R. I. It is in the middle of a great source of skilled labor; labor with years of employment on metal products. You must bring your labor to Alexandria. Any private concern would give great thought to this difference. At present there is a vast unemployment problem in Rhode Island and southern Massachusetts. It would appear good judgment to give these people jobs instead of relief money. The people of Rhode Island and New England are being lulled to sleep with the promises Newport will not be hurt. Eventually the station will be seriously crippled; it will be reduced to 1,000 employees, if not wiped out. The handwriting is plainly on the wall. Other sections of the country have just as good a claim upon Government activities as Virginia or Washington. There is altogether too much concentration here now. If the Government must be depended upon to provide the greater part of the work for the people in this country it is certainly good judgment to distribute the activities. At Newport, if they need to, they can build an addition. You have the trained personnel there now. I repeat, you would not require so much personnel and administration force as in Alexandria. We have been very good to Virginia. The major share of the naval recruits are trained at Norfolk; the bulk of the airship repairing is at Norfolk; and then you have shipbuilding plants at Norfolk and Newport News.

Surely Virginia is not suffering under the administration of its native son, Secretary Swanson. I believe the Navy officials have shown either their inefficiency in not keeping Newport more modernly equipped or else they have deliberately permitted it to run down so that the establishment of a new plant might have some effect. There is a lot of talk about assurances that up to 1944 there will be no curtailment. Who is there in this House or in this administration who can make any promise like that? How does anyone know what the year ahead will unfold.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. It is not a question of promises. It is a question of knowing how long it will take to furnish the required complement of torpedoes for the submarines, destroyers, and aircraft coming into the Naval Establishment. It is a pure matter of arithmetic. If you take the output of the two stations and the number of requirements you have as to when they can be built, it is not a question of promise; it is a question of fact.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And I say in reply to the gentleman these facts of his may all disappear in the next few years. The people of this country are groaning under tremendous taxes now, and no man knows whether we will ever be able to keep up this promised program.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Of course, if that is so, there will be no torpedo stations anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I happen to represent the Eighteenth Congressional District of California. The principal town is the city of Long Beach. Right next door is the

town of Wilmington and also the town of San Pedro. It is known as the San Pedro-Long Beach area, and that is where the principal part of the United States Fleet is right now. I represent a naval district. Every time a campaign comes along I have an opponent on the Democratic ticket or on the Republican ticket who goes before the electorate and says that the Navy is going to build this, that, or the other thing in some place other than in my district, and they begin to criticize me because I have not stood on the floor and urged that that activity be placed in my district. My opponent last year made reference to a naval supply depot that the Navy Department wants located some place in San Francisco Harbor. He got up and said:

Had I been there in this fellow's place, I would have seen to it that the naval supply depot was located in Long Beach.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, he could not have done it; and, in the second place, I am getting to the point where I am sick and tired of using the United States Navy as a method of bringing activity into any State or any congressional district. That is not what the United States Navy exists for. It does not exist to bring employment or to bring business activity or to bring men into congressional districts or into a State. It seems to me that in approaching these problems of naval activities we should determine, first, what is the need as far as the Navy is concerned and what is the practical thing to do about it. Take this subject of a torpedo station, a torpedo factory.

We have a site in the city of Long Beach where you could build a torpedo factory and we would like to put 1,000 men to work in that factory. We would like to have the four or five million dollars necessary to build that factory spent in the locality of Long Beach. We would like to continue that activity there for some time, but that would mean a cost four or five times as much as it does for this particular place. I do not believe that it is in the interest of economy, that it is in the interest of national defense, adequate or otherwise, for me to come in here and insist that in place of giving this to Virginia we ought to give it to Long Beach, and when people come here and ask and argue in favor of putting it in this locality because Virginia does not have very much, or in this other locality because they need this particular activity out there and would like to have it, I think we get clear away from the reason for the existence of the United States Navy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman can answer the question that has disturbed a good many of us for a number of days when we see these great demands for appropriations. What is all this haste about, anyway? Why could we not wait and investigate and see whether Alexandria has a water supply sufficient to have this factory? Why are we obliged to hurry through all of this great naval appropriation? What is the answer?

Mr. SCOTT. In the first place, as a partial answer, investigations have been made.

They have tested torpedoes at Piney Point, which is right at the mouth of the Potomac River where it empties into Chesapeake Bay. They know they can test torpedoes out there; so there is no rushing ahead without investigation.

Now, why the need for a new torpedo station at this time? Because the United States Fleet right now with present equipment and its present size does not have enough torpedoes to supply the ships.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BERNARD. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERNARD. Mr. Chairman, I leave to others, better informed on these matters than myself, the technical questions of battleships and airplanes, of offensive and defensive weapons. I want to speak of the broader question of peace and of the circumstances which have made it necessary for us, a people whose hearts are set on peace, to consider the problems of preparing for war.

What has forced on us the necessity of contemplating the largest naval appropriation ever proposed in peacetime? Part of the responsibility can be laid to other nations. Part—a heavy part—of the responsibility belongs to those Fascist powers which, in the President's words, lead the trend away "from the observance of both of the letter and the spirit of treaties." As the President, in his recent message to us, so truly said:

Disregard for treaty obligations seems to have followed the surface trend away from the democratic representative forms of government.

But the democracies of the world cannot escape their share of responsibility for world tension and world war madness. Our democracy has failed in the years since the World War to fulfill its duty as leader in the world struggle for peace.

Those who have led our Nation to this ignoble and dangerous position told us geography had blessed us with a safety island, safe from attack. Two oceans insure us from war they say. And then they add—two oceans plus a big army and a big navy. But oceans and navies and armies are no insurance. And the isolationists know it. Even Mr. Herbert Hoover knows it. Because it is they who demand ever bigger navies, ever more battleships, ever more money for armaments. If we are really outside the world, really safe in our little dugout, why do we need navies?

But we are not safe. And no navies and no armies can keep us safe, can keep us at peace. The only way to peace and safety for America lies through the preservation of peace and order in all the world. If the world is to turn its steps along that way, the United States must be bold in leadership, strong not in arms but in moral force. The President's historic speech at Chicago offered us a foreign policy assuring the active search for peace. If we had followed that policy for the last 10 years we should not now need to consider a big naval bill. If we will follow it from now on, the need for rearming will diminish.

I wish to call attention also to another question raised by the President when he said that peace is safest in the hands of the democracies. If world conditions now force us to contemplate a big navy, let us make sure that our military machine is a democratic one, devoted to the defense of democracy and paid for in accordance with democratic principles.

Who is to control our Army and our Navy? Before we vote money for defense let us clean the house of our armed forces. We do not want any traitor generals in control. We do not want any admirals with dictator ambitions and Fascist sympathies. If we must have an army and a navy, let us have a people's army and navy, whose leadership has been scrutinized and approved by the democratic and peace-loving people of our country.

Who is to pay for our Army and our Navy? Who is to pay for these big appropriations? Shall the people pay? No. Let us put the burden of armament on the rich, on those who look for huge profits from the next war to exceed even their profits from the last war.

Unless and until our armament appropriations are combined with concerted action by all the democratic countries for peace, with guarantees that democracy is upheld by admirals and generals, with taxation that puts the burden of armament on those best able to pay—unless and until these problems are squarely met in a democratic way—I can only abstain from voting on armament appropriation bills. It is my intention to vote always and consistently for peace.



But through armaments alone peace can never be achieved. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 25, noes 53. So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

PAY, SUBSISTENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Pay of naval personnel: For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, pay—\$35,461,649, including not to exceed \$1,720,318 for increased pay for making aerial flights, no part of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by any officer above the rank of captain, except not more than two officers of the rank of rear admiral, nor by nonflying officers or observers at a rate in excess of \$1,440 per annum, which shall be the legal maximum rate as to such nonflying officers or observers; rental allowance, \$7,433,907; subsistence allowance, \$4,476,922; in all, \$47,372,478; officers on the retired list, \$9,414,000; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$6,525; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$8,599,950; interests on deposits by men, \$3,000; pay of petty officers (not to exceed an average of 8,623 chief petty officers, of which number those with a permanent appointment as chief petty officer shall not exceed an average of 7,532), seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Bureau of Fisheries, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, extra pay for men for diving, and cash prizes (not to exceed \$107,785) for men for excellence in gunnery, target practice, communication, and engineering competitions, \$92,927,315; outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment, civilian clothing not to exceed \$15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct or undesirability or inaptitude, reimbursement in kind of clothing to persons in the Navy for losses in cases of marine or aircraft disasters or in the operation of water- or air-borne craft, and the authorized issue of clothing and equipment to the members of the Nurse Corps, \$1,939,355; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court martial, \$35,445, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; pay and allowances of the Nurse Corps, including assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors—pay, \$560,020; rental allowance, \$24,000; subsistence allowance, \$23,871; pay, retired list, \$271,976; in all, \$879,867; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps; pay and allowances of transferred and assigned men of the Fleet Naval Reserve, \$15,507,347; reimbursement for losses of property as provided in the act approved October 6, 1917 (34 U. S. C. 981, 982), as amended by the act of March 3, 1927 (34 U. S. C. 983), \$10,000; payment of 6 months' death gratuity, \$150,000; in all, \$176,845,282; and no part of such sum shall be available to pay active-duty pay and allowances to officers in excess of nine on the retired list, except retired officers temporarily ordered to active duty as members of retiring and selection boards as authorized by law: *Provided*, That, except for the public quarters occupied by the Chief of Office of Naval Operations, the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and messes temporarily set up on shore for officers attached to seagoing vessels, to aviation units based on seagoing vessels including officers' messes at the fleet air bases, and to landing forces and expeditions, and in addition not to exceed 40 in number at such places as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or other expenses of any enlisted man or civil employee performing service in the residence or quarters of an officer or officers on shore as a cook, waiter, or other work of a character performed by a household servant, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Naval Reserve without additional expense to the Government, nor the sale of meals to officers by general messes on shore as regulated by detailed instructions from the Navy Department.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: On page 24, line 19, after the semicolon, insert "extra pay to men reenlisting after honorable discharge, \$2,490,450."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this carries out practically the same action that was taken with reference to the Treasury-Post Office bill in the early part of the week. It provides the money by which the Navy can pay reenlistment allowances to men who reenlist in the Navy after their honorable

discharge. Existing law provides that if they reenlist within 90 days an allowance must be paid them. It was first established in 1855. The present way of paying it was established in the Joint Service Pay Act of 1922. In 1933, as I have mentioned before on the floor, a proviso was carried in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill doing away with this reenlistment allowance. The same thing was done in 1934, 1935, and 1936. In 1937 the provision was knocked out of the Treasury-Post Office bill on a point of order. It was then placed in the second deficiency appropriation bill by the other body of the Congress. As a result reenlistment gratuities were not paid last year. That proviso has not yet been put into any appropriation bill. We passed the Treasury-Post Office bill without the proviso. When the bill was read for amendment I offered an amendment appropriating an amount of money to pay reenlistment allowances for the Coast Guard. On representations of the chairman of the subcommittee that existing law requires the Coast Guard to pay reenlistment allowances, and upon his assurance that the money was there and that the Coast Guard enlisted personnel would be paid these reenlistment gratuities I withdrew the amendment that I offered to provide that money.

In the naval appropriation bill that we now have before us, however, the language is such that I am doubtful whether the Navy would have to pay reenlistment allowances unless we put that money into the bill; and I should like to propound this question of the chairman of the subcommittee: Under existing law, which provides for reenlistment allowances, is it the gentleman's opinion that the Navy Department would have to find the money some place to pay reenlistment allowances if we did not put the certain amount into this bill?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, replying to the gentleman, I answer his question, "Yes"; and then explain it by saying that as I understand it, the existing law controls, and unless a provision is carried in some bill this year suspending the existing law, as is being done at the present time, applicable to the present fiscal year, that the payment of reenlistment gratuities not only by the Navy Department, but by other departments of the Government affected is absolutely mandatory and the gratuity must be paid whether or not the money therefor is provided in the pending bill. I, therefore, trust that the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, because I think it is absolutely unnecessary. I think he is entirely correct in seeking to protect what he is endeavoring to do, and in bringing this matter up at this point. I have looked into his proposition and I say to him that, based upon the information I have, the payments by the Navy would be absolutely mandatory.

Mr. SCOTT. That, Mr. Chairman, is similar to the assurance that was given me by the chairman of the subcommittee on the Treasury-Post Office bill, and I think that with one exception I want to call to the attention of the chairman that it would be entirely satisfactory to me; that is, in place of carrying the language that I have suggested, that we go back to page 24, line 18, and add after the semicolon following the amount \$6,525 "pay of enlisted men on the retired list."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. If we can insert there the words "extra pay to men reenlisting after being honorably discharged," and leave out the figure, it would not increase the appropriation under the bill; there would not be any more money appropriated, but there would be in the language of the bill words that say that we will pay this reenlistment allowance unless the ban goes back in another appropriation bill, taking the words of the chairman to mean that he thinks it is absolutely mandatory. I, too, think it is absolutely mandatory, but I should think that the chairman of the committee, after his statement, would have no objection to my being guaranteed

in my position by the insertion of this language, which does not call for any additional appropriation.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I may say in reply to the gentleman from California that unless the present restriction be reenacted the payment would be mandatory. Existing law would create a legal deficiency if this appropriation were not adequate. There is no need to have specific language appear in the text here. If I thought that were not so I should gladly consent to the gentleman's proposal; but I think it would be pure surplusage, and I hope the gentleman will not insist upon it.

Mr. SCOTT. Can we not go another step and say, on page 23, that it shall include pay and allowance of naval personnel?

Mr. UMSTEAD. The truth is that the word "allowance" is already there; and I think the present language covers the gentleman's entire proposition.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think everything I have had in mind as far as this pay and allowance is concerned has been covered by the statement of the gentleman and that his assurances are all that is necessary. I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 26, line 8, after the word "Provided", insert "That commissioned line officers of the active list of the line of the Navy (Marine Corps) carried by law as additional numbers or passed over, shall be counted within the authorized total number of such commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy: *Provided further*."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman. I am willing to reserve the point of order if the gentleman would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, that it is contrary to existing law, and that it does not and will not result in any reduction in expenditures under this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. SCOTT] care to be heard?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I expect the amendment will be held germane under the exception known as the Holman rule.

I call attention to the fact the act of July 22, 1933, fixes the maximum commissioned line officers' strength of the Navy—that is, the number of line officers that we can have in the Navy at any one time—at 6,531. This is exclusive of those officers who are known as additional numbers in grade or additional numbers.

On page 84 of the hearings had by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and in the second table thereon, it will be seen that including additional numbers the line officers' strength after the commissioning of the class graduating from the Naval Academy in June, 1938, would make the line officers' strength 6,562 and after the commissioning of the graduating class in June 1939, which is within the fiscal year for which this bill makes appropriation, the number will be 6,824.

The amendment does change existing law by providing that officers in additional numbers category shall be included in the authorized line-officer strength of the Regular Navy. At the present time additional numbers are not counted as a part of the authorized line-officer strength, which, as I have said, is 6,531. If the amendment which I have offered is agreed to, the effect would be—that is, if no counteracting legislation passes in the meantime—to deny commissions to at least 293 midshipmen. It would deny commissions to at least 293 midshipmen graduating in June 1939. This would make a difference between 6,824 and the 6,531, which is the line strength authorized by law.

The table on page 91 of the hearings indicates there will be 591 graduates in June 1939. This would mean a reduction of 293 officers who otherwise would have to be appropriated for and would retrench expenditures by reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States as follows:

For pay, subsistence, and transportation in the Navy, \$44,975 in pay, including subsistence allowance, and \$1,418 in transportation, which is borne out by the figures on pages 236, 242 and 275, page 236 providing for pay, page 242 subsistence and allowance, and page 275 for transportation. This would show the exact amount that would be saved by denying commissions to 293 midshipmen graduating in June 1939.

If the amendment is ruled in order I shall later offer amendments carrying into effect the reduction of amounts that would be caused if we commissioned the 293 graduates of the academy to whom I expect to deny commissions.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment, as stated by the gentleman from California, would have the effect of placing within the presently authorized regular line officer strength of the Navy 673 officers who are now carried as so-called additional numbers. If thus included in the regular line officer strength, the number of regular line officers in the Navy would be, as stated by the gentleman, 6,552. This would be in excess of the present authorized line strength of the Navy by the difference between 6,531, the present authorized strength, and 6,552, which would be the number under the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation upon an appropriation bill, and would not result and could not result in either a reduction of personnel or a saving of money under this particular appropriation item. It is, therefore, subject to a point of order.

I wish to call the Chair's attention to an important fact relative to the amendment. There is now a law, which I think would absolutely prevent the amendment, if adopted, from either reducing personnel or reducing expenditures. I respectfully call the Chair's attention to the second part of Public, No. 390, of the Seventh-fourth Congress, which was an act amending section 5, Public Law No. 264, Seventy-third Congress, which original law was approved on May 29, 1934, and related to the appointment of Naval Academy graduates as ensigns in the Navy, and I quote as follows:

"*Provided*", so that as amended the said section will read as follows:

"That the President of the United States is authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint as ensigns in the line of the Navy all midshipmen who in 1934 and hereafter graduate from the Naval Academy: *Provided*, That all former midshipmen graduated in 1933 who received a certificate of graduation and honorable discharge or who resigned and whether they have since been married or not may, upon their own application, if physically qualified, and under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, be appointed as ensigns prior to November 1, 1935, by the President and shall take rank next after the junior ensign of the Navy and among themselves in accordance with their proficiency as shown by the order of merit at date of graduation: *And provided further*, That the number of such officers so appointed shall, while in excess of the total number of line officers otherwise authorized by law be considered in excess of the number of officers in the grade of ensign as determined by any computation, and shall be excluded from any computation made for the purpose of determining the authorized number of line officers in any grade on the active list above the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) until the total number of line officers shall have been reduced below the number otherwise authorized by law."

Mr. Chairman, I apprehend the Chair will be disturbed by the statement "appointed prior to November 1, 1935," but I respectfully call the attention of the Chair on this point to the fact that that date applies solely to a former group of graduates who has not been commissioned upon graduation, and has no bearing upon the main point of the legislation, namely that the President shall have authority to appoint all midshipmen graduating in 1934 or thereafter as ensigns in the Navy.

I submit that in the determination by the Chair of the effect of the pending amendment upon the line-officer strength of the Navy he must take this law to which I have



called attention into account, under the terms of which, irrespective of the pending amendment, future graduates of the Naval Academy will be given commissions.

I respectfully urge that the language of the statute and its clear meaning make it impossible for the pending amendment to show on its face that its adoption would accomplish either a reduction of personnel or a reduction in expenditures.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the Committee or the Chair unless there is some doubt in the mind of the Chair whether or not this amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, but would be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If there is no doubt in the mind of the Chair that the amendment is not germane, I will not take up the time of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be pleased to hear the gentleman, if the gentleman would like to be heard.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, for this amendment to be germane it must fall within the Holman rule. There are two yardsticks it must square by—one, that it must be germane and not legislation, and the other, that it brings about a retrenchment which appears on its face and a reduction in personnel. I submit as far as the amendment is concerned it does not square by that yardstick of the Holman rule. It can be demonstrated to a mathematical certainty, on the contrary, that it will have the effect of costing more and at the same time changing existing law, and therefore, of course, would not be in order.

The number of officers in the Navy is based upon the number of enlisted men. The number of enlisted men is fixed by statute at 137,450. The officer strength is fixed by law at 4% percent of the authorized enlisted strength. The method of promotion is that the selection board shall pass upon certain officers in the grades of junior lieutenant and lieutenant, and if they are not promoted they are carried as extra numbers. The purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from California is that these extra numbers shall be added to the 4% percent of line officers and become regular line officers.

What does the law say on this question? The selection law of July 22, 1935, states as follows:

That after June 30, 1936, lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade) who shall not have been recommended for promotion to the next higher grade by the report of a line selection board as approved by the President shall, on and after June 30 next succeeding the date of the approval of said line selection board, if they have completed 14 or 7 years, respectively, of commissioned service, be carried as additional numbers in grade, but shall be included in the authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy in any grade to which later promoted.

This law was later amended to make it 14 and 21 years in the grade.

My point is that under the law today officers are authorized to the number of 6,531. There are 602 officers carried as extra numbers. The figures the gentleman has read would be the figures if none of the 602 is picked up and promoted by the selection board, which is in session now. However, the selection board has a right under the law, I submit, to pick up and promote a part of the 602 officers who today are carried as extra numbers. If they do not pick up any officers, then the figures will be as the gentleman from North Carolina has submitted and as the law stands today. As the situation is today, there are only 6,491 officers, including the extra numbers that are in the service, and the selection board could in accordance with the law pick up part of the 602 officers. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I submit the statute of 1935, which permits and requires a commission to be given to every midshipman, would add to, instead of reducing, the number. Therefore, the amendment is certainly not germane and does not square itself with the requirements of the Holman rule.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly on the point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. There is no question in my mind but what this amendment changes existing law. The only argument I make is that it is permissible under the Holman rule, because it brings about a retrenchment.

If this amendment is held in order I am going to offer five amendments, in each case reducing the appropriation by a specific amount, based upon the cost which would be incurred by the Navy if the 293 midshipmen were commissioned. The effect of the amendment would be to stop all promotion, to stop all selection, and to stop all retirements right where they are now for a period of 1 year, and I can point specifically to the amount saved if it would have any effect on the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, unless the gentleman from North Carolina would like to be heard further.

In the opinion of the Chair, there is no question about the germaneness of the amendment. It seems to resolve itself largely into a question of facts and figures as to whether or not the amendment comes within the Holman rule. The part of the Holman rule, with which the members of the Committee are familiar, that is relevant here, is subsection 2 of rule XXI, which reads as follows:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Section 1511 of volume VII of Cannon's Precedents of the House, reads as follows:

A proposition reducing the number of Army officers and providing the method by which the reduction should be accomplished was held to come within the exceptions under which legislation retrenching expenditure is in order on an appropriation bill.

A reading of the amendment, together with the facts stated by the gentleman from California which, in the opinion of the Chair, have not been successfully controverted, that the amendment will actually reduce the number of officers as well as effect a retrenchment of expenditures thereby brings the amendment within the Holman rule cited by the Chair, and therefore the point of order is overruled.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to explain in one sentence exactly what this amendment would do. It would stop the present method of selection for promotion and retirement of naval officers for a period of 1 year, and do it for this reason. There are a lot of Members of this House, including myself, and there are a lot of people who have studied the problem, who think that the present method of selection in the Navy is unfair, that it is doing things that are detrimental to the Navy, that it is increasing the cost to the Government because of retirements.

About four proposals have been made to the House of Representatives as a method of improving the present selection method. To date no action has been taken on the subject of the selective system. To date we have not made any active attempt to improve the method of selection in the Navy as it works at the present time.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman, I believe, is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House?

Mr. SCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Is it not true that a number of bills are now pending before the gentleman's own committee dealing with this question of naval personnel and promotion?

Mr. SCOTT. It is according to what the gentleman means by the word "pending."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Have they not been introduced and referred to that committee?

Mr. SCOTT. They have.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Is it not true that last year, during the regular session of the Congress, the Naval Affairs Committee

held rather extensive hearings in connection with this subject?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would not call the hearings extensive, and no recommendations were forthcoming.

Mr. UMSTEAD. You did conduct hearings?

Mr. SCOTT. We did hold hearings.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Was the gentleman present at the hearings?

Mr. SCOTT. I was.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Has the gentleman's committee taken any action about it?

Mr. SCOTT. It has not.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Does not the gentleman think this is such an intricate matter, as the gentleman stated just a few moments ago, that it should be acted upon by the legislative committee rather than dealt with upon an appropriation bill?

Mr. SCOTT. I do.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Then I ask the gentleman, in all fairness, to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, no; I do think that the legislative committee should take action, but I do not believe that in the meantime, until the legislative committee has had time to take action, the inequities, the injustices, the things that can happen under the operation of the present law for the next year should be allowed to go on, and I think we should stop them now, while we are in the process of making this revision.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Assuming for the sake of the argument that the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, it only deals with dollars and cents, does it not?

Mr. SCOTT. No; I would not say that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course it does, because it does not repeal the law which is now in force.

Mr. SCOTT. It holds the operation of the selection law in abeyance for 1 year.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It only deals with the appropriation and the law that now requires them to go out would still require them to go.

Mr. SCOTT. They cannot take action without the money.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But there are men who have to go out irrespective of selection.

Mr. SCOTT. They will be held in exactly the same position they are in now, and let me say this to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], we held hearings in the legislative committee, and after the hearings were completed the Navy Department sent up another bill or a recommendation that was introduced here as a bill, changing the selective system or changing the method of promotion or suggesting such changes. It seems to me when the Navy Department itself, after the hearings had been held, suggests improvements, or what they consider improvements, or suggests changes, the admission is there that the present method is wrong and is subject to improvement; and now that we have not done anything about it, it seems to me if we will take this action here today we will force the Naval Affairs Committee and we will force the Department of the Navy to do something about the present method of selection and meet the situation the best they can. If we do not do anything within a year's time, if the legislative committee does not make any recommendation between now and then, we will go right back where we are at the present time and nobody will be hurt.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I, of course, am not familiar with the bills pending before the gentleman's committee, but I should like to ask the gentleman if he has read the bill to which he referred as having the approval of the Navy Department proposing certain changes in the selection system?

Mr. SCOTT. I have.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Does the gentleman regard the bill as having advantages over the present system?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not, and I will say in addition that I shall probably introduce the first of next week a bill providing for a new method of selection which I believe is a good measure.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Does the gentleman believe he ought to call upon the Appropriations Committee to pull the chestnuts of his own committee out of the fire?

Mr. SCOTT. No; I do not look at it in that way at all. I am simply stopping the present method of selection, if I am successful, until the Naval Affairs Committee does something about it.

Mr. FADDIS. Does not the gentleman think that the adoption of his amendment would expedite action that will remedy this most undesirable system of promotion?

Mr. SCOTT. You bet your life I do.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. FORD of California. I wish to ask the gentleman if the adoption of his amendment will not keep in the naval service the number of men who are not over 42 years of age, who are being put out, which in my judgment is one of the silliest actions that any great organization ever took.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman is right and let me add this: At the present time we promote in the Navy if there is a vacancy up above. We move from this class to this class as many as there are vacancies for and if there are no vacancies and you have eligible men for that particular vacancy, you have to kick them out of the Navy. If the vacancies are not there, although they are ready for promotion, you cannot promote them, and you have to retire them, and it was admitted on the floor of this House the other day by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs that we are retiring men who are capable of filling the positions they are in today, and who are capable of filling the positions above them, that captains could be rear admirals, and that commanders could be captains and do a good job of it, but there is no place up there because of the operation of this selective law, and, therefore, we have to kick them out of the Navy and put them on the retired list and pay them while they are on the retired list and get nothing out of their services.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I understood the gentleman, in reply to a question propounded by the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD], to say that if this amendment be adopted, and if the operation of selection boards is suspended for the fiscal year 1939, it would prevent within that year the passing from the Navy of men 44 and 45 years of age. I ask the gentleman if it is not true in all fairness that the provision which he seeks to insert in this bill would not have anything to do with whether or not a man passes out in the fiscal year '39.

Mr. SCOTT. It would stop the selection right where it is now and no action could be taken for a year's time.

Mr. UMSTEAD. But it would not stop a single man from going out of the Navy who is scheduled to go out within the year.

Mr. SCOTT. Not if he is scheduled to go out; no. It is not retroactive.

Mr. UMSTEAD. But the gentleman's statement that this action would prevent men from going out in 1939, I submit, is unfair.

Mr. SCOTT. If they have already been selected to go out, they would go out; but it would prevent the selection



board from selecting any more to go out in addition to what has been done in the past. This is not going to save any man who has been selected out of the Navy, but it will keep some good men from going out of the Navy for a year; and I hope during that year's time we can change existing law to such an extent that we will not lose the services of those good men in the future.

Mr. UMSTEAD. If the gentleman's amendment be adopted, is it not true that it actually would have the force and effect of sending men out who otherwise might be selected.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, I do not believe so.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Why would it not?

Mr. SCOTT. Because there would be no changes, no promotions, no changes in the selection system.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Why not? You have suspended selection boards.

Mr. SCOTT. We have suspended any action by the board from carrying into effect its recommendations, because of the limitation of the number of men you can have in the line.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Is it not true that the number of admirals, the number of captains and commanders, and officers in other grades is determined by the total number of officers?

Mr. SCOTT. That is true.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Well, then, if there were blanketed in under this amendment 673 officers now in the additional numbers category would not that automatically increase the number of admirals, captains, and commanders that the Navy could have?

Mr. SCOTT. No; I do not believe so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask the attention of the Committee to this very important amendment, and it is exceedingly important, because it strikes at the very heart of the line personnel and the system of promotion in the Navy. I know it is popular to say, "I am opposed to legislation which will permit men to go out who are just 41 years of age." And I would keep them in, and we should keep them in, but there are certain reasons why in military organizations you must have some method of selection, some method of promotion. Briefly what happens? The Army selects by seniority. No officer of the Army is promoted unless somebody above him either dies or resigns or is court-martialed or gets out of the Army. The man who comes in the Army on the 20th of January 1938 will be considered for promotion before the man who comes in on the 21st of January 1938.

In the Navy the system is different. Since 1916 the Navy has operated under what is known as the selection system. I ask you to bear with me briefly, form no conclusions until you know definitely what the law is, and then let us see if any hardship is being worked on anyone.

What is the selection system? It provides that the Secretary of the Navy annually shall appoint a board of one admiral and nine captains who shall take the official record of every man in the grade of lieutenant, junior grade—that is the lowest rank in the Navy except ensign—and pass upon it and determine exclusively from that record whether or not that officer is best fitted for promotion. Bear in mind the fact that in the Army a man is promoted irrespective of his qualifications if a vacancy occurs.

In this bill we are spending \$550,000,000, an enormous sum of money. We entrust these great ships, our first line of national defense, to the care of these men. It naturally follows that politics, influence, and date of enlistment, should bear no weight with reference to the promotion of

an officer. Promotion should be based entirely upon his qualification. Who makes his qualification? The officer himself makes it day by day serving in the fleet. His record is sent here and filed in the Navy Department. The board goes over every record of this officer and of other officers in the grade to see which is best qualified for the higher position. Let us assume there are 100 men eligible to be promoted, but that there are only 33 vacancies. It naturally follows that all cannot be promoted. Some have better records than others; some must be passed over. This, briefly, is what the selection board does.

What happens? So desirous is the Navy Department, and is the law, to give every man in the lower grade an opportunity to be fairly considered by the selection board that no man can go out until eight different selection boards in 8 different years have passed upon his record. I submit that after 8 boards, composed of nearly 100 different captains in the Navy, or commanders, have passed upon an officer's record, and the record, in their judgment, does not justify the officer being promoted, then it is false economy for him to be carried any longer in the Navy, and he should be placed upon the retired list.

What would be the result of the amendment? Under the law today, the total number of officers on the retired list as a result of the selective system is only 517. There are, as I said yesterday, 28,000 men carried on the retired list of the Navy, at a cost of \$33,000,000. Only 2 percent of the retired officers and personnel is the result of the operation of the selection law.

If an officer in the Navy is not promoted, of course, he is dissatisfied with the selection system; that is natural; but the officer who is promoted is satisfied. The human equation enters into it. Every officer who is promoted says that it is the wisest and best system. Every officer who is not promoted naturally says that it is the worst kind of law, because he has not been promoted; but we cannot promote officers unless there are vacancies, and the law determines what percentage of officers there shall be in each grade throughout the length and breadth of the Navy—1 percent admirals, 4 percent captains, and so forth, and so on down.

The proposed amendment, offered by my colleague from California, is that automatically we shall put these officers, who have been passed over but who under the law cannot go out until they have actually served from 14 to 21 years, into the line of the Navy. It stops the flow of promotions and stops anybody from going out of the Navy. What would be the result? The result would be stagnation; the result would be that officers who are ambitious, officers who are striving to go somewhere in the Navy would be held down to give way to some other officer who has not so fine a record of efficiency and accomplishment. The whole line of promotion would fall into stagnation.

Mr. Chairman, I introduced a bill on this matter last year at the request of the Navy Department, and for about 10 days or 2 weeks we had hearings on it. The bill has been referred to the Navy Department, and from the Navy Department it went to the Budget. It is at the Budget today to determine what it will cost and to see whether or not it is in accordance with the President's financial program. I am just as anxious as is the gentleman from California that a fair and equitable selection system should be provided; but I submit that a question so complicated as this should not be determined by an amendment which happens to come within the Holman rule. The Holman rule is no place to legislate in reference to personnel. It requires months and years to work out a fair and satisfactory selective system; and I appeal to the intelligence of this House and of this Committee this afternoon to stand by the committee and to reject the gentleman's proposal, because it will lead to confusion, it will lead to stagnation of promotion, and it will tie the hands of your committee which is trying to work out a fair and equitable method of selection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, this is not really legislating by an appropriation act, but it is true this will force a speeding up of the legislative processes, which is long overdue. If the Congress does not pass a reform in the promotion system of the Navy by the time this appropriation act becomes effective, it will simply keep in status quo the officers of the Navy for 1 year. You may rest assured if this provision is adopted and made a part of the appropriation bill, the Navy Department will agree to a satisfactory reform of the promotion system and it will be enacted into law before the appropriation ever becomes effective.

I think probably the greatest need in the Navy today—greater almost than the need for ships—is the need of modernizing the personnel system of the Navy. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs stated that the gentleman's proposal would strike at the very foundation and heart of the present selection system of the Navy. That is exactly what we are trying to do. We want to strike at the present system, which is so destructive of morale. It is a wasteful, costly system, with no justification whatever.

I do not agree, either, that the Army system is ideal or satisfactory. I believe there should be some reward for merit, a more rapid advancement for the outstanding officers, and there should be some means of eliminating at the bottom the unfit or gold-brick officer.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The effect of this amendment will be to immediately prohibit the Secretary of the Navy and the President of the United States issuing commissions to those who may graduate in June?

Mr. MAAS. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me ask the gentleman this question in reply to the one just asked: Where is there any sense in bringing young men into the Navy when it is going to cause the retirement of good men who have had experience in order to make a place for them at the bottom? Also, why hold out the hope to these men who come into the Navy that they are going to be able to go to the top when at some time during that period they are going to get their necks cut off through the selection system?

Mr. MAAS. That is the very question I was going to ask myself. The essence of this situation is that 72 percent of the commissioned strength of the Navy is in the first three lower grades. The personnel of the commissioned officers in the Navy is like a great flat platform and it suddenly narrows down into a shaft. We take in this great number of graduates from the Naval Academy at a very heavy expense to the Government and within 14 years we have reduced their number 72 percent. There is no necessity for this at all. We can work out a system which will be far more economical in actual dollars and cents and will increase the morale in the Navy 100 percent. There is no necessity for having this great number of ensigns come into the Navy.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. Is it not a fact that we have too many young men going to the United States Naval Academy?

Mr. MAAS. There is no question about that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Even admitting what the gentleman says is true, is it not a cruel thing to take young men into the Naval Academy, have them work there a number of years and successfully pass their examinations, then when they have completed their contract with the Government not give them a commission?

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman is quite correct. The testimony before our committee by the very naval officers who are defending the selection system was that there are very few naval officers retired for failure to be selected who are not competent officers and qualified to continue on and go to the next higher grade. They are not selected merely because there are no vacancies for them.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not a lot more cruel to keep them in there 10 years and then cut them off?

Mr. MAAS. Why, certainly. You have ruined their lives.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can it be definitely said this is going on for 10 years? I do not think it will.

Mr. MAVERICK. Let us stop it now.

Mr. MAAS. The vast majority of the officers who are forced out by the present selection system are not even accused of being unfit nor incompetent. They are forced out to make room for other and junior officers without the experience and value of those being replaced.

They are forced out because we are taking in too many officers at the bottom at needless cost to the Government and with no increased efficiency to the Navy.

The cost of the retired list is mounting to the point where the whole principle of providing for retired officers is being jeopardized.

There is no need to graduate such large classes from the Naval Academy.

The jobs filled by many of these young ensigns can be perfectly satisfactorily filled by a combination of appointing for 4 years graduates of naval R. O. T. C. colleges who are educated without cost to the Government and by using warrant officers and chief petty officers.

If the number of graduates at the Naval Academy is regulated to provide the number of officers needed as a base for promotion through the various grades, there will be no necessity of the present drastic elimination.

There should be enough selection to stimulate the best efforts of every officer and to properly recognize and reward outstanding merit and ability.

There should also be enough forced elimination to warn the laggards and to eliminate inefficient, incompetent, and gold-brick officers.

The rest are average officers and should be so treated. Promotion should be regular and on an equal basis for average officers.

Competent, qualified officers who do their duty should be assured of an uninterrupted career in the Navy.

Any other system is destructive of morale, wasteful, costly, and in the end injures the national defense.

The Fleet Reserve Association has a slogan we might well adopt as our national policy, "A navy second to none, manned by a personnel superior to all."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, than whom there is no better posted man on this subject in this body, and for whose judgment, ordinarily, I have the highest regard, has demonstrated by the passion with which he spoke here today in defense of his pet, the selection system of the Navy, that there is an Ethiopian in the woodpile. There is no one who knows as well as the honorable gentleman from Georgia that the system is indefensible, on its merits. He himself has admitted that it should be remodeled and revamped. The distinguished gentlemen who head the Navy high command admit in their testimony before the Appropriations Committee that its injustices should be corrected. Why, then, should he rise here in all this passion of apparent anger and inveigh against us when we say the same thing?



What justification is there? There is none. What justification can any gentleman offer for taking in 500 new officers a year and kicking most of them out within a few short years, before they reach the height of their prime, and into whose heads we have poured not only the best education that this splendid institution can give, plus the later training, at a cost of from \$24,000 to \$35,000 apiece of the taxpayers' money? I am talking not of the deadwood, the inept, but of those admittedly good, worthy officers, as efficient as many who are kept in. There can be no justification for this cruel waste both of money and men. [Applause.]

They say that only those complain who are kicked out. They cite Admiral Andrews and state that in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee last year he said that he made requests of all the officers in the Navy—over 6,000 of them—for their criticism, and that there was little or no complaint. But they do not tell you that although he requested the expression of more than 6,000 officers, he only got some 150 replies.

Of course, they said "everything is lovely," and it may have honestly seemed so to them; but what did the other 5,850 think? [Applause.] This system tends toward sycophancy. The more an officer "bootlicks" his superior, the better chance he has for promotion under this iniquitous selection system. You are sapping the manhood of the Navy. As I said in testifying before the committee in the presence of Admiral Andrews:

You need never expect, Admiral, to get a frank expression from the officers of the Navy in regard to any matter. They know better. As long as they have their heads in the lion's mouth they are never going to pull his whiskers.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman says and agree with practically everything he says, but does not the gentleman feel it would be fairer and better to stop at the beginning and not take the young men into Annapolis at all, rather than take them in and then not commission them?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do. I have always urged keeping them out rather than kicking them out.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In other words, is there not a better method of accomplishing this?

Mr. HOBBS. I agree with the gentleman, there is a better and a more fundamental way. That way is set forth in my amendment reducing the number of our appointments to Annapolis from four to three. But I also favor this amendment and urge its adoption. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I know of no system or method more detrimental to the morale and efficiency of the armed forces of the Nation than the system of promotion which now prevails within the Navy. I cannot conceive of anything which would start a young officer in under more disadvantageous conditions than to come into the service knowing that his promotion in his chosen profession was dependent upon the impression he produced among his superior officers. Nothing could be more destructive to the peace of mind of that young man than to know he and his family also had to meet the approbation of his superior officers not only in matters pertaining to his duty but also to social and other affairs connected with his daily life. Here is a system which admittedly—and this is admitted by the very supporters of the system—has ousted from the Navy a large number of efficient officers at the very time when they should be rendering their best service to the Nation in return for their education and training.

The Army operates without such a system of selection. The Army promotes largely upon seniority.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I will yield to the gentleman when I finish my statement.

While seniority prevails, down through the ranks are methods which eliminate the unfit. Officers are subject to action under the provisions of the class B board, and are subject to loss of files because of court-martial proceedings which come because of failure in their official duty. Certainly the Army is not releasing into the rank of civil life large numbers of officers who have been trained and have reached a state of efficiency whereby they should be of value to the Nation.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman inform the committee what method the Army has for elimination of these officers?

Mr. FADDIS. The Army has the class B board for such elimination.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; but it does not eliminate anyone or promote anyone. The Army had to come before Congress and get it to pass a law to promote 6,000 officers.

Mr. FADDIS. The gentleman is referring to a circumstance which took place because of the addition of officers following the World War, which was an unusual condition and does not ordinarily prevail in the Army.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is it not a fact it has been found there were in the Army lieutenants 55 and 56 years of age?

Mr. FADDIS. I have already explained to the gentleman, and I believe the rest of the Committee knows it, that this was an unusual condition which prevailed in the Army because of the large number of officers who were taken into the Army following the World War.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. I call attention to the fact this will not stop promotions in the Navy; it just holds them up for a year while we try to bring about a better method of selection than we have now.

Mr. FADDIS. Exactly; and that was the point I was trying to make. This amendment may bring some action on this matter.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman state what would happen if we did not pass such a bill?

Mr. FADDIS. I am sorry; I cannot yield further.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Chairman, I am neither an Army nor a Navy expert, but I do have some consideration for the human side of this problem. Here is what we are doing under this, which has been called an indefensible method, and I am going to call it a silly method, because that is what it is. Under this method of selection, we let a man come up through the grades for 21 years and get to the very peak of his efficiency in the service, and then, because there is not a higher job for him we let him out. You can argue for the efficiency of the Navy all you want to, but such a condition cannot help decreasing efficiency and reducing morale.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. There is no contention made that the officers who are forced out at that time are incompetent or unfit for their jobs.

Mr. FORD of California. None whatever. They are men of fine grades and fine service.

Mr. MAAS. They go out because there are no vacancies for them.

Mr. FORD of California. They are at the very peak of their efficiency.

Let us look at the human side of it. Here is a man who has gone through Annapolis and spent 21 to 28 years in the service. Some men have just been let out after having spent 21 to 28 years in the service. There was nothing against them; it was just that the selection board let them out. The selection is made by a board which is sworn to secrecy. Nobody knows why men are selected to go out or stay in, and it is against the law to tell why.

What is the human situation with regard to these men? Here is a man who has been trained to the Navy or the Marine Corps all his life. He comes to the age of 43, 44, 45, or 50. Automatically he goes out of the service at a very small annual pension. He is unfit to enter into the normal competitive stream of life in the United States and make a living. If he has a family and is dependent on his salary to bring up the family, perhaps with children who are about half way through school, he is stranded at the very best time of his life when he should give the very best service to the Navy.

I appeal to the members of the Committee to stop this nonsense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, in San Diego we have the light forces of the fleet, consisting of about 120 ships there at the present time. This means lots of officers on duty there, so I come from the fleet knowing something of the condition of the morale existing among the officers of the fleet.

At no time in the history of the United States Navy has the morale sunk to such a low point. I get this from the wives, the sisters, the mothers, and fathers of these officers. They themselves cannot speak. They do not dare say a word about this selection system.

How do you suppose they select these officers? There is a board of very fine officers who sit down here in Washington and make the selections. Naturally, they are of high rank and they do not come in contact with all the younger officers. They do not know whether this man is better than the other one.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. Not just now.

It is utterly impossible to know everybody that comes before that board, and so they say, "Well, I know Jones, and Jones is a good man," and Jones gets the vote; but as to Smith nobody has served with Smith, and Smith does not get a chance. Then Smith, at the very prime of his life, is put on the shelf, just like the young men you are going to see this year retired at about the age of 42. This is just one of the evil effects of this system. They are going to be put on the shelf and they are going to cost the taxpayers about \$4,000 a year and their place is going to be taken by someone else who is going to draw \$6,000 a year, and you will have an expense of \$10,000 for one job. The taxpayers are still going to pay this retired pay because it is the law of the land and you are not saving anything there.

All these people ask is that as long as they are efficient officers, as long as they have given the best years of their life to the defense of the Nation, they be permitted to continue until they are no good. And if anyone can show me where any one of these men, or at least the great majority of them, have been put on the shelf because they were no good, I would like to know who they are, because I know most of those of the ages of 45, 48, and down to 40.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not the Navy keep a personnel record?

Mr. IZAC. Yes; and let me show how that works. I am a happy-go-lucky commanding officer and I like everybody on my ship, and we have a happy ship, and I say, "All of you boys are fine and I am going to give you a good mark," and you get a good mark. Here is another fellow over here who says, "I am hard-boiled and I never give a good mark." You may get 3-0 over there and 4-0 over here, and when the marks go before the board it looks as if an officer who is very fine with one commanding officer cannot get to first base with another. There is no uniformity in the system.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish the gentleman would inform the Committee of this fact. As long as we have so many officers in the Navy coming out of Annapolis, there must be some system of selection; is not that correct?

Mr. IZAC. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And it is not entirely the fault of the high command of the Navy, but the fault of this Congress in turning out so many officers that we cannot handle?

Mr. IZAC. That may be part of the trouble. Admiral Andrews said to me, "Show me a better system and I will work on that." They want a better system, and I believe when you get them right down to brass tacks and say, "You have 1 year within which to work out a plan," they will work out a plan that will be acceptable to everybody.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### NAVY: LIFE WORK; RETIRED IN PRIME OF LIFE

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I have a particularly high regard for the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], because he is a naval officer who went into the Navy and came out with an open mind. I would be inclined to favor this on account of what the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] has said, if for no other.

I want to read here a statement that is in the hearing on the naval appropriation bill. This is a statement of a young man who said:

I voluntarily interrupted my education because of this national emergency. I was eventually commissioned an ensign. I was convinced by admirals and captains that I had what was necessary to make a good naval officer of my rank and age.

Then he goes on to show he was going to make this his life work, and he shows further that he fulfilled his contract satisfactorily, and then he states:

When the Navy Department secured the annulment of the section with which we were induced to enter the service, they proceeded to grease the ways to launch us out via the selection board. In 1934 legislation was secured providing for selection to grade of lieutenant commander, with forced retirement for those not selected.

Which means, of course, men are retired in the prime of life. To go on with the statement:

After that it was routine; none of the wartime officers over 40 years of age were selected, and very few of those under this age. This was the end of the wartime group.

#### NO ADMIRALS TO DIE OF MALNUTRITION OR LACK OF HOUSING

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the situation we are in: All this amendment does is to say that they shall hold the method of selection of naval officers up for 1 year, within which time we can look into this matter and see whether the present system is right or wrong.

In the meantime the admirals still wear their uniforms and do not share. In fact, everybody continues to draw pay checks promptly, and in our officer class there will be no dire poverty, suffering, or deaths because of malnutrition, lack of clothing, or inadequate housing.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we are going too fast on this naval business. Slow down!

Are we building up officers for a war? These increases of ships and men and officers are not sufficiently explained. There is no reason on earth why we cannot wait a year, and the officers cannot wait a year, until we find out whether the system is right or wrong.

#### TOO MANY MIDSHIPMEN—WHY?

My colleagues, it is the same way in the Naval Academy. We put too many cadets there—pardon me, midshipmen. Every man who has spoken has said so.

And everyone knows that the selection system now in vogue is one of the most evil things in the United States. I hope we will adopt this amendment and do something to correct this situation.

Mr. PATRICK. How would it affect the present class that is being graduated this year?

Mr. MAVERICK. They may have to wait awhile, but it might prevent us in the future putting too many officers into the Navy. We will have to stop this some day. This does not stop it, but it holds it up so that we will have time to think about it.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Does this selection system encourage applicants to play politics with the members of the selection board in order to secure promotions?

Mr. MAVERICK. I think it does even more than that. In order to explain, it would take barrack-room language



that we old soldiers have long since abandoned. The least I can say is that they call it being kind to the colonel in the Army and being very nice to the admiral.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to discuss the matter of the selection of naval officers for promotion with you. I do not happen to be an expert on that question. I have heard the selection system discussed a great deal, but I have heard things said about the conduct and operation of the system this afternoon that I have never heard before. This is no time to pass upon the merits of the selection system. We are here considering an appropriation bill. Just recall what you have listened to for the last 30 minutes. You have listened to a defense, on the one hand, and condemnation, on the other hand, of a method used in the Navy Department for the selection and promotion of its officers. I respectfully submit to the calm consideration of every man within the sound of my voice that such a method is not a proper way to legislate on this subject. We are dealing with an appropriation bill for an arm of our national defense. I think there is a great deal of merit in some of the accusations brought against the selection system. I am not here to defend it. Neither am I here to condemn it. I appeal to those of you, who have not, as the gentleman from Alabama said about the gentleman from Georgia, let his passions run wild and then proceeded to let his passions catch up with the wild passions of the gentleman from Georgia, calmly to agree with me that this is not the time or place or the proper method to pass this kind of legislation. I am right jealous about this matter of legislation on an appropriation bill. I try, so far as I can, to bring in a bill to the House that has no legislation in it. Sometimes that creeps in and quite unintentionally, but I do not believe in legislating on appropriation bills. What is the situation?

I remind you of something that has not been mentioned here except in the form of a question. If the ruling of the Chair in this case be correct, if the interpretation placed by his adviser upon this statute I referred to be correct, and if this amendment be passed, then, if no change in the law be made between now and next June, there will be exactly 262 fine young men whom you sent down here to the Naval Academy who cannot be commissioned. Why? Merely because we have undertaken indirectly to do a thing which ought to have an open and clear and adequate consideration. We would do something without realizing its full purport, perhaps, which would deny 262 commissions to the graduates of Annapolis—not because they are not needed but because, under the operation of this amendment, they could not under the law be given a commission.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I think the gentleman ought to give light on that, and I want to ask him a question.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The light is this: The difference between what this amendment will do and the number of cadets who will graduate in June next year at the Naval Academy is 262, and according to the interpretation that has been placed upon this amendment they could not be commissioned.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I want to ask the gentleman a question on that.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Very well, I yield to the gentleman if he insists.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will not all these officers in the Navy that reach retirement age under the statute be retired, regardless of whether we adopt this amendment?

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman is entirely correct, but that does not affect the figures that I have just stated. Let me appeal to you. It means nothing to me whether you vote this amendment up or down. I have not had any officer complain to me about it. I am not sore at the Navy Department, and neither am I their vassal. I undertake to come in here with what appears to me to be the best I can do with what is put before me to do with. This is not the proper way to handle this matter. The gentleman who introduced this amendment is a member of the proper committee, which he admits ought to work out a solution of the matter. I hope the Committee will vote this amendment

down and stand by us in our judgment as to orderly procedure in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. UMSTEAD) there were—ayes 81, noes 51.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. UMSTEAD and Mr. SCOTT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 93, noes 52.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 24, line 1, strike out "\$35,461,649" and insert "\$35,416,674."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply carries out the action the Committee just took by changing the amounts in the bill. The amendment eliminates the necessity for this money. I now ask, therefore, that the amount be reduced by that figure.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. On what basis does the gentleman propose his reduction in this item; to what grades in the Navy is he applying the reduction, and on what basis did he arrive at the amount by which he is seeking to reduce this bill? If the gentleman's amendment be agreed to, what assurance can he give the House that the money left in the bill will be enough with which to pay personnel?

Mr. SCOTT. Because there will be no more promotions during the fiscal year.

Mr. UMSTEAD. On the basis of what rank did the gentleman make his deduction?

Mr. SCOTT. On the basis of all the money provided in the bill for promotion allowance.

Mr. UMSTEAD. But on what rank did the gentleman base his figure—ensign, lieutenant, commander, captain, or what?

Mr. SCOTT. All of them.

Mr. UMSTEAD. How did the gentleman arrive at the amount? How many did he take from each grade?

Mr. SCOTT. I have not those figures with me at the moment.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The truth is, is it not, that the gentleman from California does not know anything about the effect of his amendment; that the adoption of this amendment might take away from officers in the Navy the pay they are entitled to during the year 1939?

Mr. SCOTT. It would not affect their pay in 1939; no.

Mr. UMSTEAD. How does the gentleman know that it would not? On what grade of officers did he figure the reduction he is proposing?

Mr. SCOTT. It is figured on the provision in here for promotion. That item is not broken down; it is carried in the bill as a lump sum.

Mr. UMSTEAD. But the gentleman knows that in the bill as presented by the committee it is figured upon the basis of an average number of officers in each grade or rank in the United States Navy during the fiscal year 1939. Now, I am asking the gentleman, and he cannot tell us, upon what basis he figured the reduction he is proposing.

Mr. SCOTT. That would be a matter for the administration of the Navy Department to figure out; they would have to figure where the reductions would apply.

Mr. UMSTEAD. And if we did not provide enough money, it would be all right, according to the gentleman's argument.

Mr. SCOTT. It would be necessary, if there were not enough money—

Mr. UMSTEAD. I ask the gentleman if he did not offer this amendment merely to undertake to show a reduction of the amount carried in this bill as reported by the committee,

without really knowing by what amount the legislative proposition which he sponsored and which has been adopted would occasion a reduction?

Mr. SCOTT. No. This is the amount that would not be needed if the men who graduate from the academy should not be commissioned.

Mr. UMSTEAD. How many men coming out of the academy does the gentleman say will not be commissioned?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not have the figures right here, but I think it is 293.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Then the gentleman agrees by his statement that these boys cannot be commissioned if the gentleman's amendment stays in the bill?

Mr. SCOTT. I agree with that. Some of the men who are coming out of the academy next year cannot be commissioned if, during the year's time, this is held in abeyance; we did not make any change in the method of selection. At the end of that time, however, the new men coming out of the academy would be commissioned.

Let me say this, because it came out during the previous debate, that if we now proceed to a review of the selection system as the House wants us to, we can take care of the men who are coming out of the academy. It seems to me much better to say to the boys now coming out of the academy: "We are going to retire you now; you can go in the outside world with the education you now have." They can do it better when they graduate than they could after 10 years in the service. It is quite a different thing then to say to a man that he has got to get out, that we know he is qualified, but he has got to get out and go to work in some other field at a later time in life.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I am diligently trying to seek information; I am not seeking to embarrass the gentleman by these figures, but I feel some sense of obligation toward the pay section of this bill. I feel that the officers and personnel involved by this amount of money are entitled to whatever pay the law says they ought to have. I do not see how the gentleman, in all fairness, can stand before this House and ask that this bill be reduced by the amount he has proposed when he does not know whether it is the correct amount or not, or what effect it might have upon the pay of personnel.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the failure of the gentleman from California to furnish the Committee the information upon which he bases his reduction shows exactly the position we are in. The gentleman said that the object of slowing up promotions and holding them in status quo for 1 year is to get a new selection-system bill. If we do get a new selection system, we shall need every dollar carried in the pending bill, because the amount here carried is predicated upon a selection system.

The purpose of the gentleman's figures is to justify the statement that he is within the Holman rule. The only purpose of it is to show that he is making a saving. Yet he cannot explain to the House, and he could not explain to the Chair when the Chair made a ruling, how it brought about the saving.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Can you explain it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It does not bring about a saving; and, of course, it could not, because the gentleman is going to ask that a promotion bill be brought in, and the promotion bill would take care of those men. All of this money is in here to take care of these men who are now being promoted. The gentleman from California should know that every officer's salary is not based upon promotion. It is also based on longevity or length of service, regardless of his rank. The gentleman now offers an amendment, and asks the Committee to adopt it, which seeks to justify the erroneous position he got himself into when he offered his first amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the gentleman has made an incorrect statement. I justify the amendment by the amount that would be saved by not bringing the men out of the Naval Academy into the commissioned service.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He is seeking now to prove his justification because he is seeking a reduction of \$60,000, yet he cannot show to the committee how he arrived at this reduction. It does not make a bit of difference to me because if he gets a new selection system then we will have to have \$35,000,000 to take care of all the men, and that is all he is after, and if he does not get it then we will have to have it anyway.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. May I ask the gentleman if under the rules now in effect in the Navy the men reaching retirement will not be replaced by men from the academy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course they will be retired. There is a law that a man must be retired who has served 14 years. He is going right straight out, irrespective of the selection law. The law says if he serves 21 years he goes out also. There is a law that says if he serves 30 years he goes out. This merely demonstrates the unwisdom of a committee trying to legislate on something as complicated as this by putting a restriction upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the vacancies caused by retirements be filled by appointments from the Naval Academy graduating class?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have just declared where we stand in regard to this policy, which was done by a very substantial majority of the members of the Committee.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Scott], in order to carry out this program, has offered an amendment in which he sets forth definitely the amount. Those who oppose the amendment, both the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Georgia, criticize and ridicule the gentleman from California because of the amount he puts in, but they do not offer any amount which they insist is the correct amount.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It should be the same.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I make the point that unless they can show the amount is wrong, then that amount should be accepted by the Committee as the correct amount. They have no argument unless they can show what the correct amount should be. They have not succeeded in doing that; therefore I feel we should agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take 5 minutes on this matter.

First of all may I correct the statement just made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I certainly said nothing, or at least I did not intend to, that would in any way ridicule my good friend, the distinguished Member from California. I merely sought information from the gentleman who offered the amendment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin says that we have not offered the correct amount, but I submit in fairness to him that he must know I cannot do that and no one else can do it when the gentleman from California could not tell us what grade his amendment affected, either by the pay scale, by the grade, or the number involved. I now repeat for the benefit of the gentleman that I was not in any way criticizing or ridiculing the gentleman from California. If course, I cannot suggest the correct amount because I do not know and the gentleman who offered the amendment has not told us the number of officers, what their ranks are, or what their pay will be.

Mr. Chairman, I can neither oppose the amendment nor advocate it because if I opposed it and if it were all right I



should regret it. If I favored the amendment and it turned out that there was a shortage in pay of the officer personnel of the Navy, I should regret it. I am in no position on the facts before me to advise the House whether or not the amendment should be adopted. I say, Mr. Chairman, if the legislation the gentleman from California says he desires is enacted into law every dollar of money under this item will be necessary and ought to be left in this bill.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Since the different classifications of the officer personnel get different salaries, depending on length of service, it is impossible to tell whether or not this is the correct amount unless you have the number of the different classes?

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman is correct; and, unless the proper classification, grading, rank, and number is known to the Member who offered the amendment, certainly the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, in fairness, cannot expect someone else who does not have that information to figure the correct total. I think it would be the part of wisdom to leave this item as it is. It would not hurt anything to leave it in here. It would not do any harm and I believe that safety compels us to leave it in, but I cannot advise the House to do so because I do not know what his amendment does.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCOTT. I certainly did not take anything the gentleman from North Carolina said as ridiculing me when he was asking for information.

I may say if 293 of the midshipmen are not commissioned, I do not know just exactly whether or not the figures I gave the gentleman will cover the situation.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Would it not be better to leave the money totals just as they are and not change them?

Mr. SCOTT. The best information I could get was that it was about this amount. As I understand it, if the amendment is not agreed to, and under the operation of the amendment the committee agreed to a moment ago, if the money provided here is not used, it will go back into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Of course it will. Therefore, I suggest to the gentleman he withdraw his amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Subsistence of naval personnel: For provisions and commuted rations for enlisted men of the Navy, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes in case of death or desertion, upon orders of the commanding officers, at 50 cents per diem, and midshipmen at 75 cents per diem, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited at the rate of 70 cents per ration in the naval hospital fund; subsistence of men unavoidably detained or absent from vessels to which attached under orders (during which subsistence rations to be stopped on board ship and no credit for commutation therefor to be given); quarters and subsistence of men on detached duty; subsistence of members of the Naval Reserve during period of active service; subsistence in kind at hospitals and on board ship in lieu of subsistence allowance of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement; in all, \$21,557,059.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: On page 27, line 21, strike out "\$21,557,059" and insert in lieu thereof "\$21,000,000."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I know of no other way of reaching the objective I am seeking than by offering this amendment. The amendment, in other words, might read as follows:

That the nine American gunboats operating on Chinese rivers within the territory of a friendly nation shall be withdrawn.

Therefore, I have sought in the only way I know how to strike \$500,000 off this appropriation, and I compute this to

be about the sum it takes to pay for the personnel on those nine Navy gunboats in China and for the maintenance of the gunboats. I have yet to hear any reason whatever from anyone why these gunboats should be in China at the present time, or why they have been there all these years.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KLEBERG. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from New York if it is not a fact that, if this \$500,000 is cut off, the gunboats would have to be maintained whether they were in Chinese waters or over here, and the personnel would also have to be maintained?

Mr. FISH. I do not see what good they would be except for that specific purpose. They were built in China for operation on Chinese rivers, and would serve no useful purpose anywhere else in the world.

Mr. KLEBERG. How about the personnel?

Mr. FISH. The personnel would have to be taken care of.

I am not worried about the money involved, because I know and everybody else in Congress knows if this amendment were adopted it would go to the Senate and the Senate committee would hold hearings on the bill, and Navy officers would appear before the committee and enable the Senate to compute the exact sum required for the purpose I have in mind. Therefore, I am not worried a bit about whether it is a dollar too large or a dollar too small.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I would rather finish my argument before yielding. The gentleman will oppose the amendment and will have plenty of time for debate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FISH. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. HILL. Although the cost would be the same if we had these gunboats here, they would not be able to promote foreign wars as they might in China?

Mr. FISH. No; and I want to discuss that issue. We could not use these gunboats here or anywhere else outside of China. They were built in China for a specific purpose. I want to know why they are there. I want to know what use they are in China. I know that the Yangtze River is filled with Chinese mines and presumably Japanese mines, and if our American gunboats continue to operate up and down this river one of them sooner or later will be blown up by a mine, and then we will have another incident to deal with. I say, in the name of peace and peaceful relations, either take these gunboats out of China or give us some reason for their being there.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

This is not a partisan matter. They have been there for 30 years and more than 30 years, under Republican administrations as well as under Democratic administrations, but the fact has just come to the attention of the American people for the first time. Even Members of Congress, unless they have been in China, did not know these gunboats were there. I submit unless we want further incidents we should take these gunboats out of China. Japan has humbly apologized for the recent attack on the *Panay* and has agreed to pay compensation and give guaranties, but Japan cannot give guaranties that our gunboats will not run into mines and be blown up or be blown up by the Chinese in an effort to incite us against the Japanese, or vice versa. Therefore, I submit we ought to act on this question, and if we need to safeguard the interests of our people in China, let us have one airplane patrol up and down the rivers with machine guns, which can do more than any nine gunboats to cope with pirates, if there are pirates left in China. Many years ago there may have been pirates on these rivers, and there may have been a purpose in placing and keeping the gunboats there. Now the only reason given is to escort the Standard Oil boats up and down the river. I do not believe in hauling down the American flag or retreating under fire or under threats, but that is not the case at present.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this is a proper amendment, and I should like to see it adopted.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course, the United States marines have to eat whether they be in China or the United States. The gentleman has offered his amendment to the section which provides for subsistence, and, I might say, not of marines but of enlisted men of the Navy. However, I respectfully submit that the boys, either of the Navy or Marine Corps, ought to be fed, no matter where the President of the United States or the Navy Department may send them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a beautiful theoretical blue print, as it were, I thoroughly agree with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. However, we are met with a practical situation. When I go to the moving pictures and see there on the screen or receive a report, as I have, from an official of one of the Departments of the United States Government, to the effect that Americans were shot down in what I call cold blood, that Americans were shot down in what appears to me to be deliberate, purposeful murder, I say it is time for the Members of this House to speak out against this sort of thing instead of coming on this floor and speaking in a way which may lead foreign nations to suppose our moral fiber in self-defense has evaporated. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel, including members of the Naval Reserve when called to active duty in time of war or during the existence of a national emergency declared by the President, \$200,944,752, plus \$3,100,000 of the appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, 1938," such amount of such appropriation being hereby reappropriated, and of the total of such amounts \$1,000,000 shall be available immediately, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the Medical Department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Administration in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers appropriated for in this Act: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipmen whose admission subsequent to January 30, 1938, would result in exceeding at any time an allowance of four midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress; of one midshipman for Puerto Rico, a native of the island, appointed on nomination of the Governor, and of four midshipmen from Puerto Rico appointed on nomination of the Resident Commissioner; and of four midshipmen from the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify in any way existing laws relative to the appointment of midshipmen at large, from the enlisted personnel of the naval service, from the Naval Reserve, from honor graduates of military schools or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calendar year 1939 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy in full commission for at least 9 months prior to such admission.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 30, line 11, strike out the word "four" and insert "three."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this question reverts to, and largely hinges upon, and dovetails with, the discussion we have had upon the Scott amendment.

All this amendment seeks to do is to reduce the number of appointments of each Congressman and Senator from four to three.

We are forcing into the officer personnel of the Navy each year something like 500 new men and because of the narrowing of the pyramid from that wide base, inevitably, good, efficient men, against whom there is no complaint, whose

records are as good as many who stay in, are being forced out, and in every one of these efficient officers, 250 of whom we are kicking out of the service every year, your Government, under laws passed by you, has invested from \$24,000 to \$35,000! That does not make sense! If you believe in economy, if you believe in efficiency in the service, if you believe what the Appropriations Committee itself advocated last year, you will vote this amendment "up."

I read from the report of the Appropriations Committee of last year which, after a paragraph or two, concludes with this statement:

These facts and considerations should be convincing that there is urgent need for further legislative consideration of the Navy's line-officer situation and raise a serious doubt as to the need or wisdom of continuing with four appointments to the Naval Academy each year.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. THOM. The passage of the gentleman's amendment means that all appointments of boys to the Naval Academy now made, who are scheduled to take examinations in March, would be declared off because there would be only three boys from each district in the academy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. TABER. The bill does not take effect until the 30th of June.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course not. This is the appropriation bill for 1939.

Mr. THOM. But the language is—

No part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman whose admission subsequent to January 30, 1938, would result—

And so forth. This would bar everybody who is appointed and is to take the examination in March.

Mr. HOBBS. If the gentleman is correct—and I have a very high regard for his judgment—I think the amendment should be adopted all the same.

It is largely in advocacy of the right of every mother's son of those boys who go to the Naval Academy that I am interested in this amendment. I claim it is a heinous crime committed by Congress to take the lives of these young boys, the flower of the youth of this Nation, and train them there and let them lay their young lives upon the altar of their country's service in the hope of regular advancement through the grades to the top, and then blast and damn their hopes, and in middle life, before they have attained the height of their efficiency in the service, with no complaint whatsoever against them, to kick 250 of them a year out of the service without reason, save that we put too many in. [Applause.] It is in advocacy of the right of these boys to live and learn and grow and go to the top, if good enough, that this amendment is being proposed.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. But do they not get a wonderful education in those 4 years?

Mr. HOBBS. They certainly do.

Mr. PIERCE. I know that some of the boys that have come out of there who did not get commissions have gone into our high schools, and I know that some of the ablest teachers we have in the West are men who came from Annapolis.

Mr. HOBBS. There is no question about that, sir, but I am looking at the problem not from the standpoint of the boys who quit or fail of their commissions then but from the standpoint of those who stay in for years, determined to make the naval service their life work, who are fit and fine, and whom we need, but cannot retain because of this shortsighted, cruel, and grossly extravagant system. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

UNFAIR TO TAKE BOY TO ANNAPOLIS, THEN KICK OUT

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we have before us today is to cut down the number of midshipmen



we send to the United States Naval Academy from four to three for each Congressman or Senator. I presented this amendment year before last and it was defeated. I support it this year—and I believe if we are consistent we should vote for this amendment. That is because the Scott amendment which we adopted provided for holding up the selection in the Army for a year, and one of the main arguments for it was that we have too many naval officers and have to let them out arbitrarily.

Mr. Chairman, when we take a man to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis and educate him and we know he is going to be thrown out 5 or 10 years from now, Congress is indulging in false pretense to the youth of this Nation.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. KITCHENS. I note on page 24 an appropriation of \$9,414,000 to meet the retired pay of the officers of the Navy. Does not the gentleman think this reduction might help to reduce that retirement-pay item?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes, of course. If we keep cramming the Naval Academy full of boys we are filling up the retired lists too.

Now, let us get this thought in our minds. The more men we put in Annapolis the bigger pay-roll navy we are building. What we want to build is a navy that can fight, a navy that has fast ships, a navy mechanically perfect—not a pay-roll navy.

One of the Members said to me a moment ago, "We may need eight of these boys instead of four." What kind of talk is that?

That is war psychology.

Everybody knows that three men are enough. I do not doubt that every Member of Congress is perfectly conscientious but do not think about the appointments we are going to make. Let us put the right number of men in there. That is the right thing to do.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Yes.

Mr. KRAMER. Recently I had an opportunity to visit Annapolis and see the way food is actually squandered and thrown away when many a person who is going hungry would be glad to have it. I am surprised at the amount of appropriation made each year to feed these people and the money wasted by getting food that is unnecessary. In other words, I mean the amount of food that is brought in there and thrown out each day.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KRAMER. Yes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I should like to ask the gentleman from California, in view of the statement he has just made, why he did not appear before our committee and give us that information?

Mr. KRAMER. Oh, I hoped that the gentleman had that information.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of how much the boys eat. I am willing for them to eat plenty if they go to the Academy.

Mr. KRAMER. It is not a question of what they eat; it is a question of what they throw away and do not eat.

Mr. MAVERICK. All right. When we send a man there, we spend \$24,000 on him, and what they eat is just a small item. Let them eat cake, for all I care. They are fine young men; but the point is we are building up too many officers and building too big a retired list.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us what the motivating influence was that caused this increase from three to four?

Mr. MAVERICK. I think it is the psychology of the Navy and of the admirals. It is the old idea down through English history that an admiral of the Navy, an officer of the Navy, is the greatest thing in the world.

The philosophy, or, rather, the psychology, of the Navy is that everything must be big. That is the idea. They have the idea that their ships will sail the seven seas and

that there must be lots of officers. I tell you when you take a young man and put him in the Navy and then kick him out it is not fair; it is not fair of us to do that. Let us reduce the number of midshipmen whom we can appoint from four to three.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, in order to cover the proposition raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM], that my amendment may be modified and perfected by changing in lines 9 and 10, "January 30" to "July 1."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The effect of that would be that it would not take the men appointed now.

Mr. HOBBS. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment by Mr. HOBBS: Page 30, at the end of line 9, strike out "January 30" and insert "July 1."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have the highest regard for the sincerity of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. I realize that he has given thought and attention to this matter. I remember that he mentioned the subject to me last year, and I recall then that I said to him substantially what he read from the report that I filed last year in connection with the bill—that I hoped that by this year we might see our way clear to reduce appointments to three. And at that time I thought it could be done. We are in a practical situation. I regret that we have gotten this phase of personnel into such confusion on the floor of the House; but let me say in all sincerity if I thought it would be safe to reduce this number to three, I believe that most of you know that I should have suggested it to our committee and that I should have contended for it in that committee. I do not believe we ought to send any more men down there than we know we shall need or have reasonable expectation of needing.

Mr. MAVERICK rose.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Just a moment; I must finish this statement. The line-officer authorized strength of the Navy is 6,531. They are working toward an objective, however, based on the completion of the Navy which we are now building, without regard to any additional plan that may be submitted to Congress, of 7,941. We are constantly increasing the enlisted personnel of the Navy to take care of vessels authorized under the Vinson-Trammell Act; and I repeat that everything in this bill is responsive to the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act and not to any subsequent program that may be offered on the floor of the House. As the new vessels come into commission, I was more or less astounded, and I am sure that perhaps some others will be surprised when they know that, in spite of the improvements in the new ships that the old ones did not have, more personnel is required. They have more guns, they have more of the things that it takes men to handle, and, instead of reducing personnel, it means an increase of personnel. We are now told that, instead of 111,000 enlisted men, it will take 118,000 enlisted men to man the treaty strength or the Vinson-Trammell Act navy. We raised the number of appointments at Annapolis in 1935 from three to four, and we have not had the opportunity to see what the full effect of the 4-year graduating class will be from the first one that will be turned out from the academy in 1939 and I think it would be unwise, as I said the day before yesterday, to change these appointments at this time. So far as I am concerned, the minute I become convinced from the whole picture of the officer situation, regardless of what you do or do not do about the selection system, that these appointments can and should be reduced I shall join with the gentleman from Alabama as quickly as anyone is suggesting that course, but I do believe it would be unwise to do so at this time. We

are having new vessels come into the fleet almost monthly, under the program of the Navy Department.

This Congress has appropriated the money. We cannot stand here this afternoon in 15 minutes and determine this question. Your subcommittee did the best it could on the evidence we had before us; and I appeal to you to let the number of appointments remain as they are until we can see what the full 4-year effect of the four appointment plan is.

Mr. MAVERICK. Does the gentleman really feel that it is imperatively necessary that the number remain at four with all the retirements we have?

Mr. UMSTEAD. In my judgment, the number ought to be left as it is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hobbs: Page 31, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and immediately thereafter add: "And provided further, That should the number of appointments to the Naval Academy from the enlisted members of the Navy not be filled, such vacancies may be filled by means of appointments by the President of midshipmen at large, in addition to the regular Presidential appointments, from those who have passed the Presidential competitive examination."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it reduces neither personnel nor money.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my point of order to permit the gentleman from Alabama to make a statement.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, in my humble judgment, the officer personnel of the United States Navy is maintaining the proud traditions of its glorious past. I believe that there are as fine men in that body as there are in any similar number of men in the world. They have a heritage to transmit to their children in Navy tradition, of pride in their service under the Stars and Stripes on all the seven seas. A prideful heritage, that. Yet, under the necessities of naval assignment, they can rarely be in one place long enough to feel at home or to have their Congressman or Senator feel that they are at home. It is exceedingly difficult, and becoming more so, for these fine men to have their boys follow in their footsteps. It seems to me that this is a definite loss to our Nation and to our Navy. [Applause.]

We provide in our appropriation bill and in our legislative bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs that 100 enlisted men in the personnel of the Navy every year may have a chance, by passing with a low grade of 2.5 the examinations that are given, to become midshipmen in Annapolis. I have the records from the Navy Department. This number of 100 has never been fully used. One year there were only 28 who qualified.

The purpose of this amendment is that, within the present appropriation, within the present policy, within the present number, these unused appointments may be utilized by the President, in addition to his regular appointments, to be given to deserving men who qualify in the Presidential competitive examinations. That is the sole purpose of this amendment. I believe it is right. I believe it is in consonance with the wisest national policy. I believe it is for the good of all; and it is a tribute to the splendid officer personnel of the Navy and to their fine boys who desire to follow in their glorious footsteps. [Applause.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman mean that these additional appointments are to be given to sons of naval officers?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

One word additional, Mr. Chairman; this will not keep out a single enlisted man who can make the low grade required of him. It simply would use what would otherwise be unused. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very clear to the Chair that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read down to and including line 5 on page 41.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8993, the Navy Department appropriation bill, 1939, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SUNDY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IGLESIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by including therein a short message from the Governor of Puerto Rico, Maj. Gen. Blanton Winship, to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which convened today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address by the Honorable John R. Quinn, past national commander of the American Legion and at the present time chairman of the Veterans' Welfare Board of California, on national defense and the merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1882) for the relief of Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, with House amendments thereto disagreed to by the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. CARLSON.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an address by the Honorable Joseph Kennedy, given in the city of Seattle last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article written at my request by Mr. Paul Garber, of the United States Museum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL HOUSING

Mr. BROWN submitted a conference report (No. 1705) and statement to accompany the bill (H. R. 8730) to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Milo Perkins of the Farm Security Administration, setting forth the livestock financing needs of the Great Plains area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RELIEF OF RALPH B. SESSOMS (H. DOC. NO. 484)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To the House of Representatives:*

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5871, Seventy-fifth Congress, an act for the relief of Ralph B. Sessoms.

This measure would authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay the sum of \$10,000 out of the appropriation for military and naval insurance to Ralph B. Sessoms in full settlement of all claims against the United States, based on Government insurance policy No. T-4367266, in the amount of \$10,000 issued to Lewis C. Sessoms, deceased.

The official records disclose that Lewis C. Sessoms on October 24, 1918, applied for and was granted yearly renewable term insurance in the amount of \$10,000. He designated his brother, Ralph Bayard Sessoms, as sole beneficiary. This insurance lapsed for nonpayment of the premium due on several occasions, and it was last reinstated, effective January 10, 1922, when premiums were paid to cover the months of January, February, and March 1922. The next premium became due on April 1, 1922, but no remittance was made until April 26, 1922, when check in the amount of \$13 was forwarded to cover the months of April and May 1922. Payment of this check was refused by the bank because of insufficient funds. The insurance lapsed for nonpayment of premium due April 1, 1922, and was not in force at the time of the veteran's death on June 10, 1922.

On two previous occasions checks in payment of insurance premiums were dishonored by the bank, and on both occasions the insured was advised that the checks had been returned. He was also advised that failure to pay premiums as required resulted in lapse of the contract and he was required to reinstate it before it could be regarded in force. The insured was therefore aware of the result of tendering an unacceptable remittance in payment of premiums.

The failure to pay the check was due to the fault of the veteran or his representative, the bank. The fact of whether the bank did or did not properly discharge its duty is a matter between the personal representative of the veteran's estate and the bank. It remains that the check tendered in payment of premiums on the insurance was not honored when presented for payment.

It is not unusual for insurance to lapse because checks tendered in payment of premiums are not honored upon presentation; the occurrence is, in fact, quite frequent. In order to keep an insurance contract in force and effect it is necessary for the insured to remit on time and in an acceptable form the premiums due, and failure to discharge this duty nullifies the contract. To pay insurance on a policy which has lapsed because of the failure of the insured to meet his responsibility of properly paying the premiums due

would create a precedent so far reaching in effect as to serve to disrupt the very basis of insurance contracts.

For these reasons I am withholding my approval of this bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 1938.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on War Claims and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT ON ALASKA, ITS RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT (H. DOC. NO. 485)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with Concurrent Resolution 24, first session Seventy-fifth Congress, passed on August 21, 1937, requesting a report in January 1938, I am transmitting herewith a report on Alaska, Its Resources and Development, prepared at my request as one of a series of regional planning studies by the National Resources Committee.

The report is in two parts. Part I contains a statement on policy and recommendations for planning prepared by a special Alaska resources committee. Part II contains a series of staff reports prepared by groups representing different Federal bureaus primarily concerned with various problems in Alaska. In order that these proposals and the supporting data may be available to the Members of Congress and to interested citizens, I recommend that the report be printed, with illustrations.

In the very limited time available for this study a substantial beginning has been made toward "a comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of the Territory of Alaska."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 20, 1938.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RANKIN (at the request of Mr. DOXEY), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. GREGORY, for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 21, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, January 21, 1938. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearings on S. 69—train lengths. Mr. J. A. Farquharson, of the Railroad Trainmen, will be the first witness.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings on H. R. 8532, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and for other purposes, Friday January 21, 1938, at 10 a. m.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, February 1, 1938, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 8344, a bill relating to the salmon fishery of Alaska.

## COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a hearing at 10:30 a. m., Friday, January 21, 1938, on H. R. 6289, granting a pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines for service in the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and H. R. 6498, granting pensions to persons who served under contract with the War Department as acting assistant or contract surgeon between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901.

The Committee on Pensions will start hearings on H. R. 8690, granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans on Tuesday, January 25, 1938, at 10 a. m.

The Committee on Pensions will hold a hearing at 10 a. m., Friday, January 28, 1938, on H. R. 8690, granting a pension to widows and dependent children of World War veterans.

## COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The Committee on Roads will hold public hearings on H. R. 8838, to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, and related proposals, on Tuesday, January 25, 1938, at 10 a. m.

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McGEHEE's Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia will meet Monday, January 24, 1938, at 10:30 a. m. in room 345, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 7470, tax exemption for the Society of the Cincinnati, and S. 1835, small claims court.

Mrs. VIRGINIA E. JENCKES' Subcommittee on Public Health, Hospitals, and Charities of the Committee on the District of Columbia, will meet Thursday, January 27, 1938, at 10 a. m. in room 345, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 3890, antivivisection.

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee in the caucus room, House Office Building, at 10:15 a. m., Friday, January 21, 1938, for the consideration of H. R. 9016, Washington Airport.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1007. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of transactions under section 10 of the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984); also two reports showing the status of credit operations as of June 30, 1937, and as of December 31, 1937; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1008. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the cancellations and adjustments, recommended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1009. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed resolution authorizing Capt. William Bowie, former Chief of the Division of Geodesy of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, of the Department of Commerce, to accept and wear the decoration of the Order of Orange-Nassau; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1010. A letter from the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, transmitting an annual report of the Rural Electrification Administration for 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1011. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a report containing information as to our experience relating to the annual report of the Acting Comptroller General of the United States for the fiscal year 1937, and particularly to statements therein on pages 25, 26, 27, and 28, and the legislative recommendation on page 13; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1012. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting in compliance with the act of May 27, 1935 (Public, No. 74), authorizing the Department of Commerce to make spe-

cial statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, a statement showing the names of those for whom work has been performed, the nature of the services rendered, the price charged for these services, and the manner in which the moneys received were deposited or used; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY: A bill (H. R. 9059) to provide a 2-year moratorium on foreclosures of Home Owners' Loan Corporation mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 9060) to provide for the construction of a Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 9061) to provide additional home-mortgage relief by providing for (1) a moratorium on foreclosures permitting appropriate legislation to provide further emergency relief to home mortgage indebtedness; (2) to further refinance home mortgages; (3) to reduce the rate of interest and extend payment and amortization of mortgages; (4) to eliminate personal and deficiency judgments in foreclosures; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 9062) to increase the duty on mustard seeds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 9063) to extend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 to include certain employees in the service of carriers at any time after June 26, 1934, and before August 29, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRINGTON: A bill (H. R. 9064) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Soldier River and the watershed thereof, in the State of Iowa, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MAY (by request): A bill (H. R. 9065) to clarify the status of pay and allowances under the provisions of the act of September 3, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 9066) authorizing and providing facilities for the training of the Coast Guard and members of the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 9067) to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9068) to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9069) to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9070) to amend section 504, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9071) to increase annual payments to State or Territorial homes for veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 9072) to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911, to a marine school at Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9073) to amend the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, approved June 3, 1924, as amended; authorizing the Secretary of War to extend the services and operations of the Inland Waterways Corporation to the Cape Fear River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANKIN: Resolution (H. Res. 406) authorizing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to make



a comprehensive survey and inspection of soldiers' hospitals and other Veterans' Administration facilities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANZETTA: Resolution (H. Res. 407) to make House Joint Resolution 440, a joint resolution declaring the policy of Congress relative to employment under the Relief Appropriation Act, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HEALEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 570) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to enable the United States to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued and salaries paid by any State, and to enable each State to lay and collect taxes on income derived by residents from securities issued and salaries paid under authority of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9074) for the relief of G. W. Bauserman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALLECK: A bill (H. R. 9075) for the relief of James I. Barnes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 9076) for the relief of Here Comes Meeks, Inc., Hamilton, Ohio; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9077) for the relief of the Miami Valley Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 9078) authorizing the President of the United States to reappoint Harry Milford Brown as a major in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IZAC: A bill (H. R. 9079) for the relief of Owen J. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KRAMER: A bill (H. R. 9080) for the relief of Edwin W. Saunders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 9081) granting a pension to Sarah White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMISANO (by request): A bill (H. R. 9082) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Allen Pope against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9083) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Sam Green; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9084) for the relief of John Lawson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIGNEY: A bill (H. R. 9085) for the relief of Charles J. Ray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9086) for the relief of Roy Webb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIGNEY: A bill (H. R. 9087) for the relief of James A. Porter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9088) for the relief of Walter Reinheimer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9089) for the relief of H. F. Cunningham, doing business as the Cunningham Dry Goods Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9090) for the relief of J. C. Ludolph; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9091) for the relief of Joe Crisp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 9092) for the relief of Reuben Owen; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3843. By Mr. BOYLAN of New York: Petition of the Rochester Association of Credit Men, regarding the Revenue Act of 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3844. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Ferdinand Caisse and other registered voters of the Second Massachusetts Congressional District, favoring the abolition of the Federal Reserve System and the restoration to Congress of its constitutional right to coin and issue money and regulate the value thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3845. By Mr. CLAYPOOL: Petition of certain residents of Logan, Ohio, opposing Senate bill 69; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3846. Also, petition of certain residents of Baltimore, Ohio, and vicinity, opposing Senate bill 69; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3847. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nyssa, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 3140, the Culklin bill to ban liquor advertising on the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3848. Also, petition of the Watertown Chamber of Commerce, Inc., E. C. Gould, secretary, Watertown, N. Y., opposing enactment of Senate bill 69, the train-limit bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3849. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the United Shoe Workers of America, New York City, urging enactment of the Federal Workweek Act and the Federal Workers Appeal Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3850. Also, petition of the United States Appraisers Stores, Local 54, endorsing the Federal Workweek Act and the Federal Workers Appeal Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3851. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the Western Construction Equipment Dealers and Distributors Association, urging the continuance of the Federal-aid highway program by permitting the Highway Act of June 16, 1936, to remain absolutely unchanged; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3852. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of Maywood Unit, No. 142, the American Legion Auxiliary of Maywood, N. J., asking favorable action on universal service bill and widows and orphans bill (S. 25 and H. R. 6384); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3853. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the American Federation of Labor relative to investigating charges of extortion and racketeering that are violating human and fundamental rights of the working people of Los Angeles and vicinity, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3854. By Mr. SHANLEY: Resolution of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, regarding Senate bill 1516, or as it is more commonly known, the Stars and Stripes fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3855. By the SPEAKER: Petition of R. Matteson, with reference to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3856. Also, petition of the East Oakland Democratic Club, Oakland, Calif., with reference to the Ludlow referendum amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 5, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

JOSH LEE, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in his seat today.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, January 20, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1832) for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by